00110768

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016

AN

Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory,

ANTIENT AND MODERN,

FROM
THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,
TO THE
BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

IN WHICH
The Riſe, Progreſs, and Variations of CHURCH POWER &c.
ARE CONSIDERED,
In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY,
and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE during that Period.

110768

By the late learned
JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D.D.
And Chancellor of the Univerſity of GOTTINGEN.

Tranſlated from the ORIGINAL LATIN,
And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES,
By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D.D.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

A NEW EDITION.

VOL. IV.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND.
MDCCXC.

00110768

AN

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

CONTAINING THE

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

FROM

The Beginning of the Reformation by Luther

TO

THE PRESENT TIMES.

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE order and method, that have been followed in the former part of this Work, cannot be continued, without the greateſt inconveniences, in this Fourth Book, which relates to the modern hiſtory of the church. From the commencement of the ſixteenth century, the face of religion was remarkably changed; the diviſions, that had formerly perplexed the church, increaſed conſiderably; and the Chriſtian ſocieties, that relinquiſhed the eſtabliſhed forms of divine worſhip, and erected themſelves into ſeparate aſſemblies, upon principles different from thoſe of the Roman hierarchy, multiplied from day to day. This circumſtance renders it impoſſible to preſent in one connected ſeries, or, as it were, in one continued tablature, the events, viciſſitudes, and revolutions, that happened in the church, divided its members, and enfeebled the dominion of its tyrants. From the period on which we now enter, the bond of union among Chriſtians, that had been formed by a blind obedience to the Roman pontifs, was everywhere either diſſolved, or, at leaſt, relaxed; and conſequently this period of our hiſtory muſt be divided into a multitude of branches, into as many parts, as there were famous ſects that aroſe in this century.

The method obſerved in the preceding part of this hiſtory changed in the Fourth book.

II. It is however proper to obſerve here, that many of the events, which diſtinguiſh this century, had a manifeſt relation to the church in general, and not to any Chriſtian ſociety in particular.

The hiſtory of the church in this century may be divided into two general heads.

ticular. And as theſe events deſerve to be mentioned ſeparately, on account of their remarkable tendency to throw a light upon the ſtate of Chriſtianity in general, as well as upon the hiſtory of each particular Chriſtian ſociety, we ſhall therefore divide this Fourth Book into two main and principal parts, of which the one ſhall contain the *General*, and the other the *Particular Hiſtory of the Chriſtian Religion.*

The general hiſtory of the church. its extent.

III. To the *General Hiſtory* belong all thoſe events which relate to the ſtate of Chriſtianity, conſidered in itſelf and in its utmoſt extent, to the Chriſtian church viewed in the general, and abſtracted from the miſerable and multiplied diviſions into which it was rent by the paſſions of men. Under this head we ſhall take notice of the advancement and progreſs of Chriſtianity in general, without any regard to the particular ſects that were thus inſtrumental in promoting its intereſts; nor ſhall we omit the conſideration of certain doctrines, rites, and inſtitutions, which appeared worthy of admiſſion to all, or, at leaſt, to the greateſt part of the Chriſtian ſects, and which conſequently produced everywhere changes and improvements of more or leſs importance.

Particular hiſtory.

IV. In the *Particular Hiſtory* of this century, we propoſe paſſing in review, in their proper order, the various ſects into which the Chriſtian church was divided. This part of our work, for the ſake of method and preciſion, we ſhall ſubdivide into two. In the *firſt* we ſhall comprehend what relates to the more *ancient* Chriſtian ſects, both in the eaſtern and weſtern hemiſpheres; while the *ſecond* ſhall be confined to the hiſtory of thoſe more *modern* ſocieties, the date of whoſe origin is poſterior to the Reformation in *Germany*. In the accounts that are here to be given of the circumſtances, fate, and doctrines of each ſect, the method laid down in the Preface to this Work ſhall be rigorouſly obſerved, as far as is poſſible; ſince it ſeems the moſt adapted to lead us to an accurate knowledge of the nature, progreſs, and tenets of every Chriſtian ſociety, that aroſe in theſe times of diſcord.

Hiſtory of the Reformation.

V. The moſt momentous event that diſtinguiſhed the church after the fifteenth century, and we may add, the moſt glorious of all the Revolutions that happened in the ſtate of Chriſtianity ſince the time of its divine and immortal Founder, was that happy change introduced into religion, which is known by the title of the *Bleſſed Reformation.* This grand revolution, which aroſe in *Saxony* from ſmall beginnings, not only ſpread itſelf with the utmoſt rapidity through all the European provinces, but alſo extended its efficacy more or leſs to the moſt diſtant parts of the globe, and may be juſtly conſidered as the main and principal ſpring which has moved the nations from that illuſtrious period, and occaſioned the greateſt part both of thoſe civil and religious revolutions that fill the annals of hiſtory down to our times. The face of *Europe* was, in a more eſpecial manner, changed by this great event. The preſent age feels yet, in a ſenſible manner, and ages to come will continue to perceive, the ineſtimable advantages it *produced*, and the inconveniences of which it has been the *innocent occaſion.* The hiſtory therefore of ſuch an important revolution, from whence ſo many others have derived their origin, and whoſe relations and connexions are ſo extenſive and univerſal, demands undoubtedly a peculiar degree of attention, and has an unqueſtionable right to the principal place in ſuch a work as this. We therefore now proceed to give a compendious view of the modern hiſtory of the Chriſtian church, according to the plan and method already laid down.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

The History of the Reformation.

The diviſion of the firſt ſection.

I. THE Hiſtory of the Reformation is too ample and extenſive to be comprehended without a certain degree of confuſion, in the uninterrupted narration of one Section; we ſhall therefore divide it into *Four* Parts.

The FIRST will contain *An Account of the State of Chriſtianity before the Commencement of the Reformation.*

The SECOND, *The Hiſtory of the Reformation, from its firſt Beginnings until the date of the Confeſſion drawn up at* Augſburg.

The THIRD will exhibit *A View of the ſame Hiſtory, from this latter period to the Commencement of the war of* Smalcald. And

The FOURTH will carry it down to *The Peace that was entered into with the Abettors of the Reformation in the year* 1555 [a]. This diviſion is natural; it ariſes ſpontaneouſly from the events themſelves.

CHAP-

---

[a] The writers of the *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, of every rank and order, are enumerated by the very learned PHILIP. FRID. HANE (who himſelf deſerves a moſt eminent rank in this claſs), in his *Hiſtoria Sacrorum a Luthero Emendatorum*, part I. cap. i. p. 1. and by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Centifolium Lutheranum*, part II. cap. clxxxvii. p. 863.—The greateſt part, or at leaſt the moſt eminent, of this liſt of authors muſt be conſulted by ſuch as deſire a farther confirmation or illuſtration

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church before the Reformation.

I. ABOUT the commencement of this century the Roman pontifs lived in the utmoſt tranquillity; nor had they, as things appeared to be ſituated, the leaſt reaſon to apprehend any oppoſition to their pretenſions, or rebellion againſt their authority; ſince thoſe dreadful commotions, which had been excited in the preceding ages by the Waldenſes, Albigenſes, and Beghards, and lately by the Bohemians, were entirely ſuppreſſed, and had yielded to the united powers of counſel and the ſword. Such of the Waldenſes as yet remained, lived contented under the difficulties of extreme poverty in the vallies of *Piedmont*, and propoſed to themſelves no higher earthly felicity, than that of leaving to their deſcendants that wretched and obſcure corner of *Europe*, which ſeparates the *Alps* from the *Pyrenean* mountains; while the handful of Bohemians, that ſurvived the ruin of their faction, and ſtill perſevered in their oppoſition to the Roman yoke, had neither ſtrength nor knowledge adequate to any new attempt, and therefore, inſtead of inſpiring terror, became objects of contempt.

CENT. XVI. SECT. I.

Things are in a quiet ſtate at the beginning of this century.

II. We muſt not, however, conclude from this apparent tranquillity and ſecurity of the pontifs and their adherents, that their meaſures were applauded, or their chains worn without reluctance.

The complaints againſt the popes and clergy ineffectual.

---

illuſtration of the matters which I propoſe to relate briefly in the courſe of this Hiſtory. The illuſtrious names of Sleidan and Seckendorff, and others, who have diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this kind of erudition, are too well known to render it neceſſary to recommend their works to the peruſal of the curious reader.

This was far from being the caſe. Not only private perſons, but alſo the moſt powerful princes and ſovereign ſtates, exclaimed loudly againſt the deſpotic dominion of the pontifs, the fraud, violence, avarice, and injuſtice that prevailed in their counſels, the arrogance, tyranny, and extortion of their legates, the unbridled licentiouſneſs and enormous crimes of the clergy and monks of all denominations, the unrighteous ſeverity and partiality of the Roman laws, and demanded publickly, as their anceſtors had done before them, a *Reformation* of the church, in its head and in its members, and a general council to accompliſh that neceſſary and happy purpoſe [*b*]. But theſe complaints and demands were not carried ſo far as to produce any good effect; ſince they came from perſons who never preſumed to entertain the leaſt doubt about the ſupreme authority of the Pope in religious matters, and who, of conſequence, inſtead of attempting, themſelves, to bring about that reformation that was ſo ardently deſired, remained entirely unactive, and looked for redreſs to the court of *Rome*, or to a general council. As long as the authority of the Roman pontif was held ſacred, and his juriſdiction ſupreme, there could be no reaſon to expect any conſiderable reformation either of the corruptions of the church or of the manners of the clergy.

[*b*] Theſe complaints and accuſations have been largely enumerated by ſeveral writers. See, among many others, VAL. ERN. LOESCHERUS, in *Actis et documentis Reformationis*, tom. i. cap. v. p. 105.—cap. ix. p. 181. & ERN. SALOM. CYPRIAN: *Præfat. ad Wilk. Ern. Tenzelii Hiſtoriam Reformat.* publiſhed at *Leipſic* in 8vo, in the year 1717.—The grievances, complained of by the Germans in particular, are amply mentioned by J. F. GEORGIUS, in his *Gravamina Imperator. et Nationis German. adverſus ſedem Roman.* cap. vii. p. 261. Nor do the wiſer and more learned among the modern Romaniſts pretend to deny that the church and clergy, before the time of LUTHER, were corrupted in a very high degree.

The reſtoration of learning.

III. If any thing ſeemed proper to deſtroy the gloomy empire of ſuperſtition, and to alarm the ſecurity of the lordly pontiffs, it was the reſtoration of learning in *Europe*, and the number of men of genius that aroſe, of a ſudden, under the benign influence of that auſpicious revolution. But even this new ſcene of things was inſufficient to terrify the lords of the church, or to make them apprehend the decline of their power. It is true, indeed, this happy revolution in the republic of letters diſpelled the gloom of ignorance, and kindled in the minds of many the love of truth and ſacred liberty. Nay, it is alſo certain that many of theſe great men, ſuch as ERASMUS and others, pointed the delicacy of their wit, or levelled the fury of their indignation, at the ſuperſtitions of the times, the corruptions of the prieſthood, the abuſes that reigned in the court of *Rome*, and the brutiſh manner of the Monaſtic Orders. But this was not ſufficient, ſince none had the courage to ſtrike at the root of the evil, to attack the papal juriſdiction and ſtatutes, which were abſurdly, yet artfully, ſanctified by the title of *canon law*, or to call in queſtion that ancient and moſt pernicious opinion, that *Chriſt* had eſtabliſhed a vicegerent at *Rome*, clothed with his ſupreme and unlimited authority. Entrenched, therefore, within theſe ſtrong-holds, the pontiffs looked upon their own authority and the peace of the church as beyond the reach of danger, and treated with indifference the threats and invectives of their enemies. Armed, moreover, with power to puniſh, and abundantly furniſhed with the means of rewarding in the moſt alluring manner, they were ready, on every commotion, to cruſh the obſtinate, and to gain over the mercenary to their cauſe; and this indeed could not but contribute conſiderably to the ſtability of their dominion.

IV. Hence

The popes. Alexander VI. Pius III.

IV. Hence it was, that the biſhops of *Rome* lived in the utmoſt ſecurity and eaſe, and being entirely free from apprehenſions and cares of every kind, followed without reluctance, and gratified without any limitation or reſtraint, the various demands of their luſts and paſſions. ALEXANDER VI., whom humanity diſowns, and who is rather to be conſidered as a monſter than as a man, whoſe deeds excite horror, and whoſe enormities place him among the moſt execrable tyrants of ancient times, ſtained the commencement of this century by the moſt tremendous crimes. The world was delivered from this papal fiend in the year 1503, by the poiſonous draught which he had prepared for others, as is generally believed; though there are hiſtorians that attribute his death to ſickneſs and old age [c]. He was ſucceeded in the pontificate by PIUS III., who, in leſs than a month, was deprived by death of that high dignity. The vacant chair was obtained by fraud and bribery by JULIAN DE LA ROVERE, who aſſumed the denomination of JULIUS II.

Julius II.

V. To the odious liſt of vices with which JULIUS II. diſhonoured the pontificate, we may add the moſt ſavage ferocity, the moſt audacious arrogance, the moſt deſpotic vehemence of temper, and the moſt extravagant and frenetic paſſion for war and bloodſhed. He began his military enterpriſes by entering into a war with the Venetians, after having ſtrengthened his cauſe by an alliance with the emperor and the king of *France* [d]. He afterwards laid ſiege to *Farrara*; and, at length, turned his arms againſt his former ally, the French monarch, in conjunction with the Venetians, Spaniards, and Swiſs, whom he had drawn into this war, and engaged in his cauſe by an offenſive league. His whole pontificate, in ſhort, was one continued ſcene of military tumult; nor did he ſuffer *Europe* to enjoy a moment's tranquillity as long as he lived. We may eaſily imagine the miſerable condition of the church under a *vicar* of CHRIST, who lived in camps, amidſt the din of arms, and who was ambitious of no other fame than that which aroſe from battles won and cities laid deſolate. Under ſuch a pontif all things muſt have gone to ruin; the laws muſt have been ſubverted, the diſcipline of the church deſtroyed, and the genuine luſtre of true religion entirely effaced.

---

[c] See the *Life* of ALEXANDER VI., in two volumes, 8vo. by ALEX. GORDON, Eſq.—As alſo another life of the ſame pontif, written with more moderation, and ſubjoined, along with that of LEO X., to the firſt volume of the learned and ingenious work, intituled, *Hiſtoire du Droit publique Eccleſiaſtique François, par M.* D. B. publiſhed in 4to, at *London*, in 1752.

[d] See DU BOS, *Hiſtoire de la Ligue de Cambray*, publiſhed at the *Hague* in two volumes, 8vo, in the year 1710.

The council of *Piſa*.

VI. Nevertheleſs, from this dreadful cloud that hung over *Europe*, ſome rays of light ſeemed to break forth, that promiſed a better ſtate of things, and gave ſome reaſon to expect that reformation in the church, that was ſo ardently and ſo univerſally deſired. LEWIS XII., king of *France*, provoked by the inſults he had received from this arrogant pontif, meditated revenge, and even cauſed a medal to be ſtruck with a menacing inſcription, expreſſing his reſolution to overturn the power of *Rome*, which was repreſented by the title of *Babylon* on this coin [e]. Several cardinals alſo, encouraged by the protection of this monarch and the emperor MAXIMILIAN I., aſſembled, in the year 1511, a council at *Piſa*, with an intention to

---

[e] See B. CHRIST. SIGISMUND. LIEBII *Commentatio de nummis Ludovici* XII., *Epigraphe*, PERDAM BABYLONIS NOMEN, *inſignibus*; Leipſic, 1717.—See alſo *Theſaurus Epiſtolicus Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 238. 243.—COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litter. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 443.—The authenticity and occaſion of this medal have been much diſputed, and, as is well known, have afforded matter of keen debate.

CENT. XVI. SECT. I.

ſet bounds to the tyranny of this furious pontif, and to correct and reform the errors and corruptions of a ſuperſtitious church. JULIUS, on the other hand, relying on his own ſtrength, and on the power of his allies, beheld theſe threatening appearances without the leaſt concern, nay, treated them with mockery and laughter. He did not, however, neglect the methods of rendering ineffectual the efforts of his enemies, that prudence dictated, and therefore gave orders for a council to meet in the palace of the Lateran in the year 1512 [*f*], in which the decrees of the council of *Piſa* were condemned and annulled in the moſt injurious and inſulting terms. This condemnation would, undoubtedly, have been followed with the moſt dire and formidable *anathemas* againſt LEWIS and other Princes, had not death ſnatched away this audacious pontif, in the year 1512, in the midſt of his ambitious and vindictive projects.

LEO X.

VII. He was ſucceeded, in the year 1513, by LEO X., of the family of MEDICIS, who, though of a milder diſpoſition than his predeceſſor, was neverthleſs equally indifferent about the intereſts of religion and the advancement of true piety. He was a protector of men of learning, and was himſelf learned as far as the darkneſs of the age would admit of. His time was divided between converſation with men of letters and pleaſure; though it muſt be obſerved, that the greateſt part of it was conſecrated to the latter. He had an invincible averſion to whatever was accompanied with ſolicitude and care, and diſcovered the greateſt impatience under events of that nature. He was remarkable for his prodigality, luxury, and imprudence, and has even been charged with impiety, if not atheiſm. He did not however neglect the grand object which the generality of his predeceſſors had ſo much at heart, even the promoting and advancing the opulence and grandeur of the Roman ſee. For he took the utmoſt care that nothing ſhould be tranſacted in the council of the Lateran, which JULIUS had aſſembled and left ſitting, that had the leaſt tendency to favour the *Reformation* of the church. He went ſtill farther; and, in a conference which he had with FRANCIS I. king of *France*, at *Bologna*, he engaged that monarch to abrogate the *Pragmatic Sanction* [g], which had been ſo long odious to the popes of *Rome*, and to ſubſtitute in its place another body of laws, more advantageous to the papacy, which were impoſed upon his ſubjects under the title of the *Concordate*, and received with the utmoſt indignation and reluctance [h].

[*f*] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. ix. p. 1559.

VIII. The

---

[g] We have mentioned this *Pragmatic Sanction*, Cent. XV, Part II. Chap. II. § XVI. note [q], and given there ſome account of its nature and deſign. This important edict is publiſhed at large in the eighth volume of the *Concilia* HARDUINI, p. 1949. as is the *Concordate*, that was ſubſtituted in its place, in the ninth volume of the ſame work, p. 1867. and in LEIBNITZ, his *Mantiſſa Codicis Diplomat.* part I. p. 158. part II. p. 358.—The hiſtory of theſe two pieces is given in an ample and accurate manner by biſhop BURNET, in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 3.—See alſo, on the ſame ſubject, DE BOULAY, *Hiſtoria Academ. Pariſ.* tom. vi. p. 61—109. DU CLOS, *Hiſtoire de Louis* XI.—*Hiſtoire du Droit Eccleſiaſtique François*, tom. i. Diſſ. ix. p. 415.—*Menigiana*, tom. iii. p. 285.

☞ [h] The king went in perſon to the parliament to offer the *Concordate* to be regiſtered, and letters patent were made out requiring all the judges and courts of juſtice to obſerve this *Act*, and ſee it executed. The parliament, after deliberating a month upon this important matter, concluded not to regiſter the *Concordate*, but to obſerve ſtill the *Pragmatic*, unleſs the *former* edict was received and eſtabliſhed in as great an aſſembly as that was, which publiſhed the *latter* in the reign of CHARLES VII. And when by violence and force they were obliged to publiſh the *Concordate*, they joined to this publication a ſolemn proteſt, and an appeal from the pope to the next general council, into both which meaſures the univerſity and the clergy entered with the greateſt alacrity and zeal. But royal and papal deſpotiſm at length prevailed.

The avarice of the popes.

VIII. The raging thirſt of dominion that conſumed theſe pontifs, and their arrogant endeavours to cruſh and oppreſs all that came within the reach of their power, were accompanied with the moſt inſatiable avarice. All the provinces of *Europe* were, in a manner, drained to enrich theſe ghoſtly tyrants, who were perpetually gaping

---

The chancellor DE PRAT, who was principally concerned in promoting the *Concordate*, has been generally regarded as an enemy to the liberties of the Gallican church. The illuſtrious and learned preſident HAINAULT has not, however, heſitated to defend his memory againſt this accuſation, and to juſtify the *Concordate* as an equitable contract, and as a meaſure attended with leſs inconveniencies than the *Pragmatic Sanction*. He obſerves, that by the king's being inveſted, by the *Concordate*, with the privilege of nominating to the biſhoprics and vacant benefices of the firſt claſs, many corruptions and abuſes were prevented, which aroſe from the ſimoniacal practices that prevailed almoſt every where while, according to the *Pragmatic Sanction*, every church choſe its biſhop, and every monaſtery its abbot. He obſerves moreover, that this nomination was the natural right of the crown, as the moſt conſiderable part of the great benefices had been created by the kings of *France*; and he inſiſts particularly on this conſideration, that the right, which Chriſtian communities have to chuſe their leaders, cannot be exerciſed by ſuch large bodies without much confuſion and many inconveniencies; and that the ſubjects, by entruſting their ſovereign with the government of the *ſtate*, inveſt him *ipſo facto* with an authority over the church, which is a *part* of the ſtate, and its nobleſt branch. See HAINAULT, *Abregé Chronologique de l'Hiſtoire de France*, in the *Particular Remarks* that are placed at the end of the reign of LEWIS XIV.

The moſt ſpecious objection that was made to the *Concordate* was this: that, in return for the nomination to the vacant benefices, the king granted to the popes the *annates*, or *firſt fruits*, which had ſo long been complained of as an intolerable grievance. There is, however, no mention of this equivalent in the *Concordate*. And it was by a papal bull that ſucceeded this compact, that the pontifs claimed the payment of the *firſt fruits*, of which they had put themſelves in poſſeſſion in the year 1316, and which had been ſuſpended by the *Pragmatic Sanction*. See the *Hiſtoire du Droit Eccleſiaſtique François*. As this ſubſtitution of the *Concordate*, in the place of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, was a moſt important tranſaction, and had a very great influence upon the minds of the Engliſh, the tranſlator judged it neceſſary to give here ſome account of that matter.

after new acceſſions of wealth, in order to augment the number of their friends and the ſtability of their dominion. And indeed, according to the notions commonly entertained, the rulers of the church ſeemed to have a fair enough pretext, from the nature of their character, to demand a ſort of tribute from their flock; for none can deny to the ſupreme governors of any ſtate (and ſuch was the character aſſumed by the popes) the privilege of levying tribute from thoſe over whom they bear rule. But as the name of *tribute* was every way proper to alarm the jealouſy and excite the indignation of the civil magiſtrate, the pontifs were too cunning to employ it, and had recourſe to various ſtratagems and contrivances to rob the ſubject without ſhocking the ſovereign, and to levy taxes under the ſpecious maſk and pretext of religion. Among theſe contrivances, the diſtribution of *indulgences,* which enabled the wealthy to purchaſe impunity for their crimes by certain ſums applied to religious uſes, held an eminent rank. This traffic of *indulgences* was conſtantly renewed whenever the coffers of the church were exhauſted. On theſe occaſions, they were recommended warmly to the ignorant multitude under ſome new, ſpecious, yet fallacious pretext, and were greedily ſought after, to the great detriment both of individuals and of the community.

The pope's authority held inferior to that of a council.

IX. Notwithſtanding the veneration and homage that were almoſt every where paid to the Roman pontifs, they were far from being univerſally reputed infallible in their deciſions, or unlimited in their authority. The wiſer part of the German, French, Flemiſh, and Britiſh nations, conſidered them as liable to error, and bounded by law. The councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* had contributed extremely to rectify the notions of the people in that reſpect; and from that period all Chriſtians, except the ſuperſtitious monks and paraſites of *Rome*, were perſuaded that the pope was ſubordinate to a general council, that his decrees were not infallible, and that the council had a right to depoſe him, whenever he was convicted of groſs errors or enormous crimes. Thus were the people, in ſome meaſure, prepared for the reformation of the church; and hence that ardent deſire, that earneſt expectation of a general council, which filled the minds of the wiſeſt and beſt Chriſtians in this century. Hence alſo thoſe frequent appeals that were made to this approaching council, when the court of *Rome* iſſued out any new edict, or made any new attempt repugnant to the dictates of piety and juſtice.

The corruption of the lower orders of the clergy.

X. The licentious examples of the pontifs were zealouſly imitated in the lives and manners of the ſubordinate rulers and miniſters of the church. The greateſt part of the biſhops and canons paſſed their days in diſſolute mirth and luxury, and ſquandered away, in the gratification of their luſts and paſſions, the wealth that had been ſet apart for religious and charitable purpoſes. Nor were they leſs tyrannical than voluptuous: for the moſt deſpotic princes never treated their vaſſals with more rigour and ſeverity, than theſe ghoſtly rulers employed towards all ſuch as were under their juriſdiction. The decline of virtue among the clergy was attended with the loſs of the public eſteem; and the moſt conſiderable part of that once-reſpected body became, by their ſloth and avarice, their voluptuouſneſs and impurity, their ignorance and levity, contemptible and infamous, not only in the eye of the wiſe and good, but alſo in the univerſal judgment of the multitude [*i*].

[*i*] See CORNELII AURELII GAUDANI *Apocalypſis, ſeu Viſio Mirabilis ſuper miſerabili Statu Matris Eccleſiæ*, in CASPAR. BURMANNI *Analect. Hiſt. de Hadriano* VI. p. 245. printed in 4to, at *Utrecht*, in 1727.

Nor could the caſe be otherwiſe as matters were now conſtituted; for, as all the offices and dignities of the church were become *venal* every where, the way of preferment was inacceſſible to merit, and the wicked and licentious were rendered capable of riſing to the higheſt eccleſiaſtical honours.

The ſtate of the monaſtic orders.

XI. The prodigious ſwarms of monks that overſpread *Europe* were univerſally conſidered as cumberers of the ground, and occaſioned murmurs and complaints every where. And, nevertheleſs, ſuch was the genius of the age, of an age that was but juſt emerging from the thickeſt gloom of ignorance, and was ſuſpended, as it were, in a dubious ſituation between darkneſs and light, that theſe monaſtic drones would have remained undiſturbed, had they taken the leaſt pains to preſerve any remains even of the external air of decency and religion, that uſed to diſtinguiſh them in former times. But the Benedictine and the other monkiſh fraternities, who were inveſted with the privilege of poſſeſſing certain lands and revenues, broke through all reſtraint, made the worſt poſſible uſe of their opulence, and, forgetful of the gravity of their character and of the laws of their order, ruſhed headlong into the ſhameleſs practice of vice in all its various kinds and degrees. On the other hand, the Mendicant orders, and eſpecially thoſe who followed the rule of St. DOMINICK and St. FRANCIS, though they were not carried away with the torrent of licentiouſneſs that was overwhelming the church, yet they loſt their credit in a different way; for their ruſtic impudence, their ridiculous ſuperſtitions, their ignorance, cruelty, and brutiſh manners, alienated from them the minds of the people, and diminiſhed their reputation from day to day. They had the moſt barbarous averſion to the arts and ſciences, and expreſſed a like abhorrence of certain eminent and learned men, who endeavoured to open the paths of ſcience to the purſuits of the ſtudious youth, recommended the culture of the mind, and attacked the barbariſm of the age in their writings and in their diſcourſe. This is ſufficiently evident from what happened to REUCLINUS, ERASMUS, and other learned men.

The Dominicans.

XII. Among all the monaſtic orders, none enjoyed a higher degree of power and authority than the Dominican friars, whoſe credit was great, and their influence univerſal. This will not appear at all ſurpriſing, when we conſider that they filled very eminent ſtations in the church, preſided every where over the terrible tribunal of the *inquiſition*, and had the care of ſouls, with the function of *confeſſors*, in all the courts of *Europe*; a circumſtance this, which, in theſe times of ignorance and ſuperſtition, manifeſtly tended to put the moſt of the European princes in their power. But, notwithſtanding all this credit and authority, the Dominicans had their enemies; and about this time their influence began to decline. Nay, ſeveral marks of perfidy, that appeared in the meaſures they employed to extend their authority, expoſed them juſtly to the public indignation. Nothing more infamous than the frauds they practiſed to accompliſh their purpoſes, as may be ſeen, among other examples, by the tragedy they acted at *Bern*; in the year 1509 [k]. They were perpetually

---

☞ [k] This moſt impious fraud is recorded at length by RUCHAT, at the end of the ſixth volume of his *Hiſtoire de la Reformation en Suiſſe*; and alſo by HOTTINGER, in his *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Helvet.* tom. i. p. 334. There is alſo a compendious, but diſtinct, narration of this infernal ſtratagem, in Biſhop BURNET's *Travels through France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland*, p. 31. The ſtratagem in queſtion was the conſequence of a rivalſhip between the Franciſcans and Dominicans, and more eſpecially of their controverſy concerning the *Immaculate Conception* of the Virgin MARY. The *former* maintained, that ſhe was born without the blemiſh of *Original Sin*; the *latter* aſſerted the contrary. The doctrine of the Franciſcans, in an age perpetually employed in ſtigmatiſing, with the opprobrious mark of *Hereſy*, numbers of learned and

---

age of darkneſs and ſuperſtition, could not but be popular; and hence the Dominicans loſt ground from day to day. To ſupport the credit of their Order, they reſolved, at a chapter held at *Vimpſen* in the year 1504, to have recourſe to fictitious viſions and dreams, in which the people at that time had an eaſy faith; and they determined to make *Bern* the ſcene of their operations. A perſon named JETZER, who was extremely ſimple, and much inclined to auſterities, and who had taken their habit, as a lay-brother, was choſen as the inſtrument of the deluſions they were contriving. One of the four Dominicans, who had undertaken the management of this plot, conveyed himſelf ſecretly into JETZER's cell, and about midnight appeared to him in a horrid figure, ſurrounded with howling dogs, and ſeeming to blow fire from his noſtrils, by the means of a box of combuſtibles which he held near his mouth. In this frightful form he approached JETZER's bed, told him that he was the ghoſt of a Dominican, who had been killed at *Paris*, as a judgment of Heaven for laying aſide his monaſtic habit; that he was condemned to purgatory for this crime; adding, at the ſame time, that, by his means, he might be reſcued from his miſery, which was beyond expreſſion. This ſtory, accompanied with horrible cries and howlings, frighted poor JETZER out of the little wits he had, and engaged him to promiſe to do all that was in his power to deliver the Dominican from his torment. Upon this, the impoſtor told him, that nothing but the moſt extraordinary mortifications, ſuch as the *Diſcipline of the Whip* performed during eight days by the whole monaſtery, and JETZER's lying proſtrate in the form of one crucified in the chapel during maſs, could contribute to his deliverance. He added, that the performance of theſe mortifications would draw down upon JETZER the peculiar protection of the Bleſſed Virgin; and concluded by ſaying, that he would appear to him again, accompanied with two other ſpirits. Morning was no ſooner come, than JETZER gave an account of this apparition to the reſt of the convent, who all unanimouſly adviſed him to undergo the diſcipline that was enjoined him; and every one conſented to bear his ſhare of the taſk impoſed. The deluded ſimpleton obeyed, and was admired as a ſaint by the multitudes that crowded about the convent, while the four friars that managed the impoſture magnified, in the moſt pompous manner, the miracle of this apparition, in their ſermons and in their diſcourſe. The night after, the apparition was renewed with the addition of two impoſtors, dreſſed like devils, and JETZER's faith was augmented by hearing from the ſpectre all and pious men, in encroaching upon the rights and properties of others to augment their poſſeſſions,

---

all the ſecrets of his life and thoughts, which the impoſtors had learned from his confeſſor. In this and ſome ſubſequent ſcenes (the detail of whoſe enormities, for the ſake of brevity, we ſhall here omit), the impoſtor talked much to JETZER of the Dominican order, which he ſaid was peculiarly dear to the Bleſſed Virgin; he added, that the Virgin knew herſelf to be conceived in *Original Sin*; that the doctors who taught the contrary were in purgatory; that the Bleſſed Virgin abhorred the Franciſcans for making her equal with her ſon; and that the town of *Bern* would be deſtroyed for harbouring ſuch plagues within her walls. In one of theſe apparitions, JETZER imagined that the voice of the ſpectre reſembled that of the prior of the convent, and he was not miſtaken; but, not ſuſpecting a fraud, he gave little attention to this. The prior appeared in various forms, ſometimes in that of St. BARBARA, at others in that of St. BERNARD; at length he aſſumed that of the Virgin MARY, and, for that purpoſe, clothed himſelf in the habits that were employed to adorn the ſtatue of the Virgin in the great feſtivals; the little images, that on theſe days are ſet on the altars, were made uſe of for angels, which, being tied to a cord that paſſed through a pulley over JETZER's head, roſe up and down, and danced about the pretended Virgin to increaſe the deluſion. The Virgin, thus equipped, addreſſed a long diſcourſe to JETZER, in which, among other things, ſhe told him, that ſhe was conceived in *original Sin*, though ſhe had remained but a ſhort time under that blemiſh. She gave him, as a miraculous proof of her preſence, a *hoſt*, or conſecrated wafer, which turned from white to red in a moment; and after various viſits, in which the greateſt enormities were tranſacted, the *Virgin-prior* told JETZER, that ſhe would give him the moſt affecting and undoubted marks of her ſon's love, by imprinting on him the *five wounds* that pierced JESUS on the croſs, as ſhe had done before to St. LUCIA and St. CATHERINE. Accordingly, ſhe took his hand by force, and ſtruck a large nail through it, which threw the poor dupe into the greateſt torment. The next night this maſculine virgin brought, as he pretended, ſome of the linen, in which Chriſt had been buried, to ſoften the wound, and gave JETZER a ſoporific draught, which had in it the blood of an unbaptized child, ſome grains of incenſe and of conſecrated ſalt, ſome quickſilver, the hairs of the eye-brows of a child, all which, with ſome ſtupifying and poiſonous ingredients, were mingled together by the prior with magic ceremonies, and a ſolemn dedication of himſelf to the devil in hope of his ſuccour. This draught threw the poor wretch into a ſort of lethargy, during which ſions, and in laying the moſt iniquitous ſnares and ſtratagems for the deſtruction of their adverſaries.

---

which the monks imprinted on his body the other four wounds of Chriſt in ſuch a manner that he felt no pain. When he awakened, he found, to his unſpeakable joy, theſe impreſſions on his body, and came at laſt to fancy himſelf a repreſentative of Chriſt in the various parts of his paſſion. He was, in this ſtate, expoſed to the admiring multitude on the principal altar of the convent, to the great mortification of the *Franciſcans*. The *Dominicans* gave him ſome other draughts, that threw him into convulſions, which were followed by a voice conveyed through a pipe into the mouths of two images, one of Mary and another of the child Jesus; the former of which had tears painted upon its cheeks in a lively manner. The little Jesus aſked his mother, by means of this voice (which was that of the prior's), why ſhe wept? and ſhe anſwered, that her tears were owing to the impious manner in which the Franciſcans attributed to *her* the honour that was due to *him*, in ſaying that ſhe was conceived and born without ſin.

The apparitions, falſe prodigies, and abominable ſtratagems, of theſe Dominicans, were repeated every night; and the matter was at length ſo groſsly over-acted, that, ſimple as Jetzer was, he at laſt diſcovered it, and had almoſt killed the prior, who appeared to him one night in the form of the Virgin with a crown on her head. The Dominicans fearing, by this diſcovery, to loſe the fruits of their impoſture, thought the beſt method would be to own the whole matter to Jetzer, and to engage him, by the moſt ſeducing promiſes of opulence and glory, to carry on the cheat. Jetzer was perſuaded, or at leaſt appeared to be ſo. But the Dominicans, ſuſpecting that he was not entirely gained over, reſolved to poiſon him; but his conſtitution was ſo vigorous, that, though they gave him poiſon five ſeveral times, he was not deſtroyed by it. One day they ſent him a loaf prepared with ſome ſpices, which, growing green in a day or two, he threw a piece of it to a wolf's whelps that were in the monaſtery, and it killed them immediately. At another time they poiſoned the *hoſt*, or conſecrated wafer, but, as he vomited it up ſoon after he ſwallowed it, he eſcaped once more. In ſhort, there were no means of ſecuring him, which the moſt deteſtable impiety and barbarity could invent, that they did not put in practice, till, finding at laſt an opportunity of getting out of the convent, he threw himſelf into the hands of the magiſtrates, to whom he made a full diſcovery of this infernal plot. The affair being brought to *Rome*, commiſſaries were ſent from thence to examine the matter; and the whole cheat being fully proved, the four friars were

-ries [*l*]. And they were the principal counſellors, by whoſe inſtigation and advice Leo X. was determined to that moſt raſh and imprudent meaſure, even the public condemnation of LUTHER.

The ſtate of learning, and of the public ſchools.

XIII. The principal places in the public ſchools of learning were filled very frequently by monks of the Mendicant orders. This unhappy circumſtance prevented their emerging from that ignorance and darkneſs, which had ſo long enveloped them; and it alſo rendered them inacceſſible to that auſpicious light of improved ſcience, whoſe ſalutary beams had already been felt in ſeveral of the European provinces. The inſtructors of youth, dignified with the *venerable* titles of *Artiſts*, *Grammarians*, *Phyſicians*, and *Dialecticians*, loaded the memories of their laborious pupils with a certain quantity of barbarous terms, arid and ſenſeleſs diſtinctions, and ſcholaſtic precepts delivered in the moſt inelegant ſtyle; and all ſuch as could repeat this jargon with a certain readineſs and rapidity, were conſidered as men of uncommon eloquence and erudition. The whole body of the philoſophers extolled ARISTOTLE beyond all meaſure; while ſcarcely any ſtudied him, and none underſtood him. For what was now exhibited, as the philoſophy of that famous Grecian

---

ſolemnly degraded from their prieſthood, and were burnt alive on the laſt day of May, 1509. JETZER died ſome time after at *Conſtance*, having poiſoned himſelf, as was believed by ſome. Had his life been taken away before he had found an opportunity of making the diſcovery already mentioned, this execrable and horrid plot, which, in many of its circumſtances was conducted with art, would have been handed down to poſterity as a ſtupendous miracle. This is a very brief account of the matter; ſuch as are deſirous of a more circumſtantial relation of this famous impoſture, may conſult the authors mentioned in the beginning of this note.

[*l*] See BILIB. PIRKHEIMERI *Epiſtola ad Hadrianum Pontif. Maxim. de Dominicanorum flagitiis*, in opp. ejus, p. 372. This letter is alſo to be found in GERDESII *Introd. ad Hiſtor. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. i. p. 170. Append.

ſage, was really nothing more than a confuſed and motley heap of obſcure notions, ſentences, and diviſions, which even the public doctors and heads of ſchools were unable to comprehend. And if, among theſe thorns of ſcholaſtic wiſdom, there was any thing that had the appearance of fruit, it was cruſhed and blaſted by the furious wranglings and diſputes of the *Scotiſts* and *Thomiſts*, the *Realiſts* and *Nominaliſts*, whoſe clamours and contentions were unhappily heard in all the European academies.

The ſtate of theology.

XIV. The wretched and ſenſeleſs manner of teaching theology in this century, may be learned from many books yet extant, which were wrote by the divines it produced, and which, in reality, have no other merit than their enormous bulk. The expoſitors of the holy ſcriptures were very few in number, during this century; and there were ſcarcely any of the Chriſtian doctors that had a critical knowledge of the ſacred oracles. This kind of knowledge was ſo rare, that, when LUTHER aroſe, there could not be found, even in the univerſity of *Paris*, which was conſidered as the firſt and moſt famous of all the public ſchools of learning, a ſingle perſon qualified to diſpute with him, or oppoſe his doctrine, upon a ſcripture foundation. Any commentators, that were at this time to be found, were ſuch, as, laying aſide all attention to the true meaning and force of the words of ſcripture, which their profound ignorance of the original languages and of the rules of criticiſm rendered them incapable of inveſtigating, gave a looſe to their vain and irregular fancies, in the purſuit of myſterious ſignifications. The greateſt part of the public teachers belonged to theſe claſſes of divines, which we have formerly mentioned under the titles of *Poſitivi* and *Sententiarii*, who were extremely fond, the *former* of loading their accounts, both of the truths and precepts of religion, with multiplied quotations and authorities from the writings of the ancient doctors; the *latter* of explaining the doctrines of the goſpel by the rules of a ſubtile and intricate philoſophy.

The liberty of debating religious ſubjects.

XV. It muſt at the ſame time be obſerved, that the divines of this century diſputed with a good deal of freedom upon religious ſubjects, and even upon thoſe that were looked upon as moſt eſſential to ſalvation. There were ſeveral points of doctrine, which had not been as yet fixed and determined by the authority of the church; nor did the pontifs, without ſome very urgent reaſon, reſtrain the right of private judgment, or force the conſciences of men, except in thoſe caſes where doctrines were adopted that ſeemed detrimental to the ſupremacy of the apoſtolic ſee, or to the temporal intereſts of the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders. Hence it is, that we could mention many Chriſtian doctors before Luther, who inculcated not only with impunity, but even with applauſe, the very ſame tenets that afterwards drew upon him ſuch heavy accuſations and ſuch bitter reproaches. And it is beyond all doubt, that this great reformer might have propagated theſe opinions without any danger of moleſtation, had he not pointed his warm remonſtrances againſt the opulence of *Rome*, the overgrown fortunes of the biſhops, the majeſty of the pontifs, and the towering ambition of the Dominicans.

The nature of religious worſhip as it was celebrated at this time.

XVI. The public worſhip of the Deity was now no more than a pompous round of external ceremonies, the greateſt part of which were inſignificant and ſenſeleſs, and much more adapted to dazzle the eyes than to touch the heart. The number of thoſe, who were at all qualified to adminiſter public inſtruction to the people, was not very conſiderable; and their diſcourſes, which contained little elſe than fictitious reports of miracles and prodigies, inſipid fables; wretched quibbles, and illiterate jargon, deceived the multitude inſtead of inſtructing them. Several of theſe ſermons are yet extant, which it is impoſſible to read without the higheſt indignation and contempt. Thoſe who, on account of their gravity of manners, or their ſuppoſed ſuperiority in point of wiſdom and knowledge, held the moſt diſtinguiſhed rank among theſe vain declaimers, had a common-place ſet of ſubjects allotted to them, on which they were conſtantly exerciſing the force of their lungs and the power of their eloquence. Theſe ſubjects were, the authority of the holy mother church, and the obligations of obedience to her deciſions; the virtues and merits of the ſaints, and their credit in the court of heaven; the dignity, glory, and love of the Bleſſed Virgin; the efficacy of relicks; the duty of adorning churches, and endowing monaſteries; the neceſſity of good works (as that phraſe was then underſtood) to ſalvation; the intolerable burnings of *purgatory*, and the utility of *indulgences*. Such were the ſubjects that employed the zeal and labours of the moſt eminent doctors of this century; and they were, indeed, the only ſubjects that could tend to fill the coffers of the *good old mother church*, and advance her temporal intereſts. A miniſtry, who would have taken it into their heads to inculcate the doctrines and precepts of the goſpel, to exhibit the example of its divine author, and the efficacy of his mediation, as the moſt powerful motives to righteouſneſs and virtue, and to repreſent the love of God and mankind as the great duties of the Chriſtian life, ſuch a miniſtry would have been very unprofitable ſervants to the church and to the papacy, however they might have promoted the cauſe of virtue and the ſalvation of ſouls.

XVII. The

The cor-rupt and miſerable condition of the people in general.

XVII. The ſtate of things, that we have been now deſcribing, exhibits to our view the true cauſes of that incredible ignorance in religious matters, which reigned univerſally in all countries, and among all ranks and orders of men; an ignorance accompanied with the vileſt forms of ſuperſtition, and the greateſt corruption of manners. The clergy, who preſided over the rites and ceremonies of the church, were far from ſhewing the leaſt diſpoſition to enlighten the ignorance or to check the ſuperſtition of the times; nay, inſtead of oppoſing, they rather nouriſhed and promoted them, as conducive to their ſafety, and favourable to their intereſts. Nor was there more zeal ſhewn in ſtemming the torrent of immorality and licentiouſneſs, than in diſpelling the clouds of ſuperſtition and ignorance. For the prudence of the church had eaſily foreſeen, that the traffic of *indulgences* could not but ſuffer from a diminution of the crimes and vices of mankind; and that, in proportion as virtue gained an aſcendant upon the manners of the multitude, the profits ariſing from *expiations, ſatisfactions*, and ſuch like eccleſiaſtical contrivances, muſt neceſſarily decreaſe.

A reformation in the church ardently deſired.

XVIII. Such then was the diſmal condition of the church. Its corruption was complete, and the abuſes that it permitted were gone to the greateſt height of enormity. But in proportion to the greatneſs of this corruption was the ardor and impatience with which all, who were endowed with any tolerable portion of ſolid learning, genuine piety, or even good ſenſe, deſired to ſee the church reformed and purged from theſe ſhocking abuſes. And the number of thoſe who were affected in this manner was very conſiderable in all parts of the weſtern world. The greateſt part of them, indeed, were, perhaps, over-moderate in their demands. They did not extend their views ſo far as a change in the form of eccleſiaſtical government, a ſuppreſſion of thoſe doctrines, which, however abſurd, had acquired a high degree of credit by their antiquity, nor even to the abrogation of thoſe rights and ceremonies, which had been multiplied in ſuch an extravagant manner, to the great detriment of true religion and rational piety. All they aimed at was, to ſet limits to the overgrown power of the pontifs, to reform the corrupt manners of the clergy, and to prevent the frauds that were too commonly practiſed by that order of men; to diſpel the ignorance and correct the errors of the blinded multitude, and to deliver them from the heavy and unſupportable burthens that were impoſed upon them under religious pretexts. But as it was impoſſible to obtain any of theſe ſalutary purpoſes without the ſuppreſſion of various abſurd and impious opinions, from whence the grievances complained of ſprung, and, indeed, without a general reformation of the religion that was publicly profeſſed; ſo was this *reformation* ſuppoſed to be ardently, though ſilently, wiſhed for, by all thoſe who publicly demanded the *reformation of the church in its head and in its members.*

The Myſtics.

XIX. If any ſparks of real piety ſubſiſted under this deſpotic empire of ſuperſtition, they were only to be found among the *Myſtics*. For this ſect, renouncing the ſubtilty of the ſchools, the vain contentions of the learned, with all the acts and ceremonies of external worſhip, exhorted their followers to aim at nothing but internal ſanctity of heart, and communion with God, the centre and ſource of holineſs and perfection. Hence the *Myſtics* were loved and reſpected by many perſons, who had a ſerious ſenſe of religion, and were of a tender and devotional complexion. But as they were not entirely free from the reigning ſuperſtitions, but aſſociated many vulgar errors with their practical precepts and directions; and as their exceſſive paſſion for contemplation led them into many chimerical notions, and ſometimes into a degree of fanaticiſm that approached to madneſs; more effectual ſuccours than theirs were neceſſary to combat the inveterate errors of the times, and to bring about the reformation that was expected with ſuch impatience.

CHAP. II.

The Hiſtory of the Reformation, from its firſt beginnings, to the Confeſſion given in at Augſburg.

The dawn of a reformation riſes unexpectedly.

I. WHILE the Roman pontif ſlumbered in ſecurity at the head of the church, and ſaw nothing throughout the vaſt extent of his dominion but tranquillity and ſubmiſſion; and while the worthy and pious profeſſors of genuine Chriſtianity almoſt deſpaired of ſeeing that reformation on which their moſt ardent deſires and expectations were bent; an obſcure and inconſiderable perſon aroſe, on a ſudden, in the year 1517, and laid the foundation of this long-expected change, by oppoſing, with undaunted reſolution, his ſingle force to the torrent of papal ambition and deſpotiſm. This extraordinary man was MARTIN LUTHER, a native of *Aiſleben*, in *Saxony*, a monk of the Auguſtinian *Eremites*, who were one of the Mendicant orders, and, at the ſame time, profeſſor of divinity in the academy that had been erected at *Wittemberg*, a few years before this period, by FREDERIC the *Wiſe*. The papal chair was, at this time, filled by LEO X.; MAXIMILIAN I., a prince of the houſe of *Auſtria*, was king of the Romans, and emperor of *Germany*; and FREDERIC, already mentioned, elector of *Saxony*.

The bold efforts of this new adverſary of the pontifs were honoured with the applauſes of many, but few or none entertained hopes of their ſucceſs. It ſeemed ſcarcely poſſible that this puny DAVID could hurt a GOLIAH, whom ſo many heroes had oppoſed in vain.

Luther.

II. None of the qualities or talents that diſtinguiſhed LUTHER were of a common or ordinary kind. His genius was truly great and unparalleled; his memory vaſt and tenacious; his patience in ſupporting trials, difficulties, and labour, incredible; his magnanimity invincible, and independent on the viciſſitudes of human affairs; and his learning moſt extenſive, conſidering the age in which he lived. All this will be acknowledged even by his enemies, at leaſt by ſuch of them as are not totally blinded by a ſpirit of partiality and faction. He was deeply verſed in the theology and philoſophy that were in vogue in the ſchools during this century, and he taught them both with the greateſt reputation and ſucceſs in the academy of *Wittemberg*. As a philoſopher, he embraced the doctrine of the *Nominaliſts*, which was the ſyſtem adopted by his order; while, in divinity, he followed chiefly the ſentiments of AUGUSTIN; but in both he preferred the deciſions of Scripture and the dictates of right reaſon before the authority and opinions of fallible men. It would be equally raſh and abſurd to repreſent this great man as exempt from error and free from infirmities and defects; yet, if we except the contagious effects of the age in which he lived, and of the religion in which he had been brought up, we ſhall perhaps find but a few things in his character that render him liable to reproach [m].

III. The

---

[m] The writers who have given any circumſtantial account of LUTHER and his tranſactions are accurately enumerated by JO. ALB.

Indulgences preached up by John Tetzel in 1517.

III. The firſt opportunity that this great man had of unfolding to the view of a blinded and deluded age, the truth, which had ſtruck his aſtoniſhed ſight, was offered by a Dominican, whoſe name was JOHN TETZEL [n]. This bold and enterpriſing monk had been choſen, on account of his uncommon impudence, by ALBERT archbiſhop of *Mentz* and *Magdeburg*, to preach and proclaim, in *Germany*, thoſe famous *indulgences* of LEO X., which adminiſtered the remiſſion of all ſins, paſt, preſent, and to come, however enormous their nature, to thoſe who were rich enough to purchaſe them. The frontleſs monk executed this iniquitous commiſſion not only with matchleſs inſolence, indecency [o], and fraud, but even carried his impiety ſo far as to derogate from the all-ſufficient power and influence of the merits of CHRIST. At this, LUTHER, unable to ſmother his juſt indignation, raiſed his warning voice, and, in ninety-five propoſitions, maintained publicly at *Wittemberg*, on the 30th of September, in the year 1517, cenſured the extravagant extortion of theſe queſtors, and plainly pointed out the Roman pontif as a partaker of their guilt, ſince he ſuffered the people to be ſeduced, by ſuch deluſions, from

---

JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Centifolium Lutheranum*; the firſt part of which was publiſhed at *Hamburg* in the year 1728, and the ſecond in 1730, in 8vo.

[n] The hiſtorians who have particularly mentioned TETZEL, and his odious methods of deluding the multitude, are enumerated in the work quoted in the preceding note, part I. p. 47. part II. p. 530.—What is ſaid of this vile deceiver by ECHARD and QUETIF, in the *Scriptores Ordin. Predicator.* tom. ii. p. 40. diſcovers the blindeſt zeal and the meaneſt partiality.

☞ [o] In deſcribing the efficacy of theſe indulgences, TETZEL ſaid, among other enormities, that *even had any one raviſhed the mother of God, he* (TETZEL) *had wherewithal to efface his guilt.* He alſo boaſted, that *he had ſaved more ſouls from hell by theſe* INDULGENCES, *than St.* PETER *had converted to Chriſtianity by his preaching,* placing their principal confidence in CHRIST, the only proper object of their truſt. This was the commencement and foundation of that memorable rupture and revolution in the church, which humbled the grandeur of the lordly pontifs, and eclipſed ſo great a part of their glory [p].

IV. This

☞ [p] Dr. MOSHEIM has taken no notice of the calumnies invented and propagated by ſome late authors, in order to make LUTHER's zealous oppoſition to the publication of *Indulgences* appear to be the effect of ſelfiſh and ignoble motives. It may not, therefore, be improper to ſet that in a true light; not that the cauſe of the reformation (which muſt ſtand by its own intrinſic dignity, and is in no way affected by the views or characters of its inſtruments) can derive any ſtrength from this inquiry; but as it may tend to vindicate the perſonal character of a man, who has done eminent ſervice to the cauſe of religion.

Mr. HUME, in his *Hiſtory of the Reign of* HENRY VIII., has thought proper to repeat what the enemies of the reformation, and ſome of its dubious or ill-informed friends, have advanced, with reſpect to the motives that engaged LUTHER to oppoſe the doctrine of indulgences. This elegant and perſuaſive hiſtorian tells us, that the *Auſtin friars had* USUALLY *been employed in* Saxony *to preach indulgences, and from this truſt had derived both profit and conſideration*; that ARCEMBOLDI *gave this occupation to the Dominicans* *; that MARTIN LUTHER, *an Auſtin friar, profeſſor in the univerſity of* Wittemberg, RESENTING THE AFFRONT PUT UPON HIS ORDER, *began to preach againſt the abuſes that were committed in the ſale of indulgences, and, being provoked by oppoſition, proceeded even to decry indulgences themſelves* †. It were to be wiſhed, that Mr. HUME's candour had engaged him to examine this accuſation better, before he had ventured to repeat it For, in the *firſt* place, it is not true, that the *Auſtin friars had been* USUALLY *employed in* Saxony *to preach indulgences*. It is well known, that the commiſſion had been offered alternately, and ſometimes jointly, to all the Mendicants, whether *Auſtin friars*, *Dominicans*, *Franciſcans*, or *Carmelites*. Nay, from the year 1229, that lucrative commiſſion was principally entruſted with the *Dominicans* ‡; and, in the records which relate to indulgences, we

* HUME's *Hiſtory of England, under the Houſe of Tudor*, vol. i. p. 119.

† Id. ib. p. 120.

‡ See WEISMANNI, *Memorabilia Hiſtoriæ Sacræ N. T.* p. 1051. 1115.

rarely

The true ſtate of the debate between Luther and Tetzel.

IV. This debate between LUTHER and TETZEL was, at firſt, a matter of no great moment, and might

rarely meet with the name of an Auſtin friar, and not one ſingle act, by which it appears that the Roman pontif ever named the friars of that Order to the office under conſideration. More particularly it is remarkable, that, for half a century before LUTHER (*i. e.* from 1450 to 1517), during which period indulgences were ſold with the moſt ſcandalous marks of avaricious extortion and impudence, we ſcarcely meet with the name of an Auſtin friar employed in that ſervice; if we except a monk, named *Palzius*, who was no more than an underling of the papal queſtor RAYMOND PERALDUS; ſo far is it from being true, that the Auguſtin order were excluſively, or even *uſually*, employed in that ſervice *. Mr. HUME has built his aſſertion upon the ſole authority of a ſingle expreſſion of PAUL SARPI, which has been abundantly refuted by DE PRIERO, PALLAVICINI, and GRAWESON, the mortal enemies of LUTHER.—But it may be alleged, that, even ſuppoſing it was not *uſual* to employ the Auguſtin friars alone in the propagation of indulgences, yet LUTHER might be offended at ſeeing ſuch an important commiſſion given to the Dominicans excluſively, and that, conſequently, this was his motive in oppoſing the propagation of indulgences. To ſhew the injuſtice of this allegation, I obſerve,

Secondly, That, in the time of LUTHER, the preaching of indulgences was become ſuch an odious and unpopular matter, that it is far from being probable, that LUTHER would have been ſolicitous about obtaining ſuch a commiſſion, either for himſelf or for his Order. The princes of *Europe*, with many biſhops and multitudes of learned and pious men, had opened their eyes upon the turpitude of this infamous traffic; and even the Franciſcans and Dominicans, towards the concluſion of the fifteenth century, oppoſed it publickly, both in their diſcourſes and in their writings †. Nay more, the very commiſſion which is ſuppoſed to have excited the envy of LUTHER, was offered by LEO to the general of the Franciſcans, and was refuſed both by him and his Order ‡, who gave it over entirely to ALBERT, biſhop of *Mentz* and *Magdeburg*. Is it then to be imagined, that either LUTHER or the other Auſtin friars aſpired after a commiſſion of which the Franciſcans were aſhamed? Beſides it is a miſtake to affirm, that this office was given to might have been terminated with the utmoſt facility, had Leo X. been diſpoſed to follow the healing

---

* See HAPPII *Diſſertat. de Nonnullis Indulgentiarum*, Sæc. xiv. et xv. *Quæſtoribus.* p. 384. 387.

† See WALCH. *Opp. Luther*, tom. xv. p. 114. 283. 312. 349.—SECKENDORF. *Hiſt. Lutheraniſmi*, lib. i. ſect. vi. p. 13.

‡ See WALCH. *loc. cit.* p. 371.

the Dominicans in general; ſince it was given to Tetzel alone, an individual member of that Order, who had been notorious for his profligacy, barbarity, and extortion.

But that neither reſentment nor envy were the motives that led Luther to oppoſe the doctrine and publication of indulgences, will appear with the utmoſt evidence, if we conſider, in the *third* place,—That he was never accuſed of any ſuch motives, either in the edicts of the pontifs of his time, or amidſt the other reproaches of the contemporary writers, who defended the cauſe of *Rome*, and who were far from being ſparing of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary adverſaries of Luther are abſolutely ſilent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the diſpute about indulgences was carried on with the greateſt warmth and animoſity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach Luther with theſe ignoble motives of oppoſition now under conſideration. I ſpeak not of Erasmus, Sleidan, De Thou, Guicciardini, and others, whoſe teſtimony might be perhaps ſuſpected of partiality in his favour; but I ſpeak of Cajetan, Hoostrat, De Prierio, Emser, and even the infamous John Tetzel, whom Luther oppoſed with ſuch vehemence and bitterneſs. Even Cochlæus was ſilent on this head during the life of Luther; though, after the death of that great reformer, he broached the calumny I am here refuting. But ſuch was the ſcandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their ſiſter vices *, that Pallavicini, Bossuet, and other enemies of Luther, were aſhamed to make uſe either of his name or teſtimony. Now, may it not be fairly preſumed, that the contemporaries of Luther were better judges of his character, and the principles from which he acted, than thoſe who lived in after-times? Can it be imagined, that motives to action, which eſcaped the prying eyes of Luther's contemporaries, ſhould have diſcovered themſelves to us, who live at ſuch a diſtance of time from the ſcene of action, to M. Bossuet, to Mr. Hume, and to other abettors of this ill-contrived and fooliſh ſtory. Either there are no rules of moral evidence, or Mr. Hume's aſſertion is entirely groundleſs.

I might add many other conſiderations to ſhew the unreaſonableneſs of ſuppoſing that Luther expoſed himſelf to the rage of the Roman pontif, to the perſecutions of an exaſpeing method which common prudence muſt have naturally pointed out on ſuch an occaſion. For, after all, this was no more than a private diſpute between two monks, concerning the extent of the pope's power with reſpect to the remiſſion of ſin. LUTHER confeſſed that the Roman pontif was clothed with the power of remitting the *human* puniſhments inflicted upon tranſgreſſors, *i. e.* the puniſhments denounced by the church, and its viſible head the biſhop of *Rome*; but he ſtrenuouſly denied that his power extended to the remiſſion of the *divine* puniſhments allotted to offenders, either in this preſent, or in a future ſtate; affirming, on the contrary, that theſe puniſhments could only be removed by the merits of CHRIST, or by voluntary acts of mortification and penance undertaken and performed by the tranſgreſſor. The doctrine of TETZEL was, indeed, directly oppoſite to the ſentiments of LUTHER; for this ſenſeleſs or deſigning monk aſſerted, that all puniſhments, preſent and future, human and divine, were ſubmitted to the authority of the Roman pontif, and came within the reach of his abſolving power. This matter had often been debated before the preſent period; but the popes had always been prudent enough to leave it undecided. Theſe debates, however, being ſometimes treated with neglect, and at others carried on without wiſdom, the ſeeds of diſcord gained imperceptibly new acceſſions of ſtrength and vigour, and from ſmall beginnings produced, at length, revolutions and events of the moſt momentous nature.

---

* Sleidan. *De Statu Rel. et Reip. in Dedic. Epiſt. ad Auguſt. Elector.*

rated clergy, to the ſeverity of ſuch a potent and deſpotic prince as CHARLES V., to death itſelf, and that from a principle of avarice and ambition. But I have ſaid enough to ſatisfy every candid mind.

The adverſaries of Luther and the patrons of Tetzel.

V. The ſentiments of Luther were received with applauſe by the greateſt part of *Germany*, which had long groaned under the avarice of the pontifs, and the extortions of their tax-gatherers, and had murmured grievouſly againſt the various ſtratagems that were daily put in practice, with the moſt frontleſs impudence, to fleece the rich, and to grind the faces of the poor. But the votaries of *Rome* were filled with horror, when they were informed of the opinions propagated by the Saxon reformer; more eſpecially the Dominicans, who looked upon their order as inſulted and attacked in the perſon of Tetzel. The alarm of controverſy was therefore ſounded, and Tetzel himſelf appeared immediately in the field againſt Luther, whoſe ſentiments he pretended to refute in two academical diſcourſes, which he pronounced on occaſion of his promotion to the degree of doctor in divinity. In the year following (1518) two famous Dominicans, Sylvester de Prierio and Hogstrat, the former a native of *Italy*, and the latter a *German*, roſe up alſo againſt the adventurous reformer, and attacked him at *Cologn* with the utmoſt vehemence and ardour. Their example was ſoon followed by another formidable champion, named Eckius, a celebrated profeſſor of divinity at *Ingolſtadt*, and one of the moſt zealous ſupporters of the Dominican order. Luther ſtood firm againſt theſe united adverſaries, and was neither vanquiſhed by their arguments, nor daunted by their talents and reputation; but anſwered their objections and refuted their reaſonings with the greateſt ſtrength of evidence, and a becoming ſpirit of reſolution and perſeverance. At the ſame time, however, he addreſſed himſelf by letters, written in the moſt ſubmiſſive and reſpectful terms, to the Roman pontif and to ſeveral of the biſhops, ſhewing them the uprightneſs of his intentions, as well as the juſtice of his cauſe, and declaring his readineſs to change his ſentiments, as ſoon as he ſhould ſee them fairly proved to be erroneous.

A conference is held between Luther and Cajetan at *Augſburg.*

VI. At firſt, LEO X. beheld this controverſy with indifference and contempt; but, being informed by the emperor MAXIMILIAN I., not only of its importance, but alſo of the fatal diviſions it was likely to produce in *Germany*, he ſummoned LUTHER to appear before him at *Rome*, and there to plead the cauſe which he had undertaken to maintain. This papal ſummons was ſuperſeded by FREDERICK *the Wiſe*, elector of *Saxony*, who pretended, that the cauſe of LUTHER belonged to the juriſdiction of a German tribunal, and that it was to be decided by the eccleſiaſtical laws of the empire. The pontif yielded to the remonſtrances of this prudent and magnanimous prince, and ordered LUTHER to juſtify his intentions and doctrines before cardinal CAJETAN, who was, at this time, legate at the diet of *Augſburg*. In this firſt ſtep the court of *Rome* gave a ſpecimen of that temerity and imprudence with which all its negociations, in this weighty affair, were afterwards conducted. For, inſtead of reconciling, nothing could tend more to inflame matters than the choice of CAJETAN, a Dominican, and, conſequently, the declared enemy of LUTHER, and friend of TETZEL, as judge and arbitrator in this nice and perilous controverſy.

The iſſue of this conference.

VII. LUTHER, however, repaired to *Augſburg*, in the month of October 1518, and conferred, at three different meetings, with CAJETAN himſelf [q], concerning the points in debate. But had he even been diſpoſed to yield to the court of *Rome*, this imperious legate was, of all others, the moſt improper to encourage him in the execution of ſuch a purpoſe. The high ſpirit of LUTHER was not to be tamed by the arrogant dictates of mere authority; ſuch, however, were the only methods of perſuaſion employed by the haughty cardinal. He, in an overbearing tone, deſired LUTHER to renounce his opinions, without even attempting to prove them erroneous, and inſiſted, with importunity, on his confeſſing humbly his fault, and ſubmitting reſpectfully to the judgment of the Roman pontif [r]. The Saxon reformer could not think of yielding to terms ſo unreaſonable in themſelves and ſo deſpotically propoſed; ſo that the conferences were abſolutely without effect. For LUTHER, finding his adverſary and judge inacceſſible to reaſon and argument, left *Augſburg* all of a ſudden, after having appealed from the preſent deciſions of the pontif to thoſe which he ſhould pronounce, when better informed; and, in this ſtep, he ſeemed yet to reſpect the dignity and authority of the biſhop of *Rome* [s]. But LEO X., on the other hand, let looſe the reins to ambition and deſpotiſm, and carried things to the utmoſt extremity; for, in the month of November, this ſame year, he publiſhed a ſpecial edict, *commanding* his ſpiritual ſubjects to acknowledge his *power of delivering from all the puniſhments due to ſin and tranſgreſſion of every kind.* As ſoon as LUTHER received information of this inconſiderate and violent meaſure, he perceived, plainly, that it would be impoſſible for him to bring the court of *Rome* to any reaſonable terms; he therefore repaired to *Wittemburg*, and, on the 28th of November, appealed from the pontif to a general council.

---

[q] There is a large account of this cardinal given by QUETIF and ECHARD, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. ii. p. 14.

---

[r] The imperious and imprudent manner in which CAJETAN behaved towards LUTHER was highly diſapproved of even at the court of *Rome*, as appears, among other teſtimonies, from PAULO SARPI's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, book I. p. 22. The conduct of CAJETAN is defended by ECHARD, in his *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator.* tom. ii. p. 15., but with little prudence, and leſs argument. The truth of the matter is, that the court of *Rome*, and its unthinking ſovereign, were not leſs culpable than CAJETAN in the whole of this tranſaction. Since they might eaſily foreſee, that a Dominican legate was of all others the moſt unlikely to treat LUTHER with moderation and impartiality, and conſequently the moſt improper to reconcile matters.

[s] See B. CHRIST. FRID. BORNERI *Diſſ. de Colloquio Lutheri cum Cajetano.* Leipſ. 1722, in 4to. VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Acta et Documenta Reformat.* tom. ii. cap. xi. p. 435. opp. *Lutheri*, tom. xxiv. p. 409.

The tranſactions of Miltitz.

All the projects of reconciliation diſconcerted in 1519.

VIII. In the mean time, the Roman pontif became ſenſible of the imprudence he had been guilty of in entruſting CAJETAN with ſuch a commiſſion, and endeavoured to mend the matter by employing a man of more candour and impartiality, and better acquainted with buſineſs, in order to ſuppreſs the rebellion of LUTHER, and to engage that reformer to ſubmiſſion and obedience. This new legate was CHARLES MILTITZ, a Saxon knight, who belonged to the court of LEO X., and whoſe lay-character expoſed him leſs to the prejudices that ariſe from a ſpirit of party, than if he had been clothed with the ſplendid purple, or the monaſtic frock. He was alſo a perſon of great prudence, penetration, and dexterity, and every way qualified for the execution of ſuch a nice and critical commiſſion as this was. LEO, therefore, ſent him into *Saxony* to preſent to FREDERICK the golden conſecrated *roſe* (which the pontifs are uſed to beſtow, as a peculiar mark of diſtinction, on thoſe princes, for whom they have, or think proper to profeſs, an uncommon friendſhip and eſteem), and to treat with LUTHER, not only about finiſhing his controverſy with TETZEL, but alſo concerning the methods of bringing about a reconciliation between him and the court of *Rome*. Nor, indeed, were the negotiations of this prudent miniſter entirely unſucceſsful; for, in his firſt conference with LUTHER, at *Altenburg*, in the year 1519, he carried matters ſo far as to perſuade him to write a ſubmiſſive letter to LEO X., promiſing to obſerve a profound ſilence upon the matters in debate, provided that the ſame obligation ſhould be impoſed upon his adverſaries. This ſame year, in the month of October, MILTITZ had a ſecond conference with LUTHER in the caſtle of *Leibenwerd*, and a third the year following, at *Lichtenberg* [t]. Theſe meetings, which were reciprocally conducted with moderation and decency, gave great hopes of an approaching reconciliation; nor were theſe hopes ill founded [u]. But the violent proceedings of the enemies of LUTHER, and the arrogant ſpirit, as well as unaccountable imprudence, of the court of *Rome*, blaſted theſe fair expectations, and kindled anew the flames of diſcord.

The nature of the conferences between Miltitz and Luther.

☞ [w] IX. It was ſufficient barely to mention the meaſures taken by CAJETAN to draw LUTHER anew under the papal yoke; becauſe theſe meaſures were, indeed, nothing more than the wild ſuggeſtions of ſuperſtition and tyranny, maintained and avowed with the moſt frontleſs impudence. A man, who began by commanding the reformer to renounce his errors, to believe, and that upon the dictates of mere authority, that *one drop of Chriſt's blood, being ſufficient to redeem the*

---

[t] See B. CHRIST. FRID. B. The records, relating to the embaſſy of MILTITZ, were firſt publiſhed by ERN. SALOMON CYPRIANUS, in *Addit. ad* WILH. ERN. TENZELII *Hiſtor. Reformat.* tom. i. ii.—As alſo by VAL. ERN. LOSCHERUS, in his *Acta Reformat.* tom. ii. c. xvi. & tom. iii. cap. ii.

[u] In the year 1519, LEO X. wrote to LUTHER in the ſofteſt and moſt pacific terms. From this remarkable letter (which was publiſhed in the year 1742, by LOSCHERUS, in a German work, intituled, *Unſchuld Nachrict)* it appears, that at the court of *Rome* they looked upon a reconciliation between LUTHER and the pontif as certain and near at hand.

☞ [w] This whole ninth ſection is added to Dr. MOSHEIM's work by the tranſlator, who thought that this part of LUTHER's hiſtory deſerved to be related in a more circumſtantial manner, than it is in the original.

whole human race, the remaining quantity, that was ſhed in the garden and upon the croſs, was left as a legacy to the church; to be a treaſure from whence indulgences were to be drawn and adminiſtered by the Roman pontifs [x]*:* ſuch a man was not to be reaſoned with. But MILTITZ proceeded in quite another manner, and his conferences with the Saxon reformer are worthy of attention. He was ordered, indeed, to demand of the elector, that he would either oblige LUTHER to renounce the doctrines he had hitherto maintained, or, that he would withdraw from him his protection and favour. But, perceiving that he was received by the elector with a degree of coldneſs that bordered upon contempt, and that LUTHER's credit and cauſe were too far advanced to be deſtroyed by the efforts of mere authority, he had recourſe to gentler methods. He loaded TETZEL with the bittereſt reproaches, on account of the irregular and ſuperſtitious means he had employed for promoting the ſale of indulgences, and attributed to this miſerable wretch all the abuſes that LUTHER had complained of. TETZEL, on the other hand, burthened with the iniquities of *Rome*, tormented with a conſciouſneſs of his own injuſtice and extortions, ſtung with the opprobrious cenſures of the new legate, and ſeeing himſelf equally deſpiſed and abhorred by both parties, died of grief and deſpair [y]. This incendiary being ſacrificed as a victim to cover the Roman pontif from re-

---

☞ [x] Such, among others ſtill more abſurd, were the exexpreſſions of CAJETAN, which he borrowed from one of the *Decretals* of CLEMENT VI. called (and that juſtly for more than one reaſon) *Extravagants*.

☞ [y] LUTHER was ſo affected by the agonies of deſpair under which TETZEL laboured, that he wrote him a pathetic letter of conſolation, which however produced no effect. His infamy was perpetuated by a picture, placed in the church of *Pinna*, in which he is repreſented ſitting on an aſs, and ſelling indulgences.

proach, MILTITZ entered into a particular converſation with LUTHER, at *Altenburg*, and, without pretending to juſtify the ſcandalous traffic in queſtion, required only, that he would acknowledge the four following things: "*1ſt*, That "the people had been ſeduced by falſe notions of "indulgences: *2dly*, That he (LUTHER) had "been the cauſe of that ſeduction, by repreſenting indulgences as much more heinous than "they really were: *3dly*, That the odious conduct of TETZEL alone had given occaſion to "theſe repreſentations: and *4thly*, That, though "the avarice of ALBERT, archbiſhop of *Mentz*, "had ſet on TETZEL, yet that this rapacious tax-gatherer had exceeded by far the bounds of his "commiſſion." Theſe propoſals were accompanied with many ſoothing words, with pompous encomiums on LUTHER's character, capacity, and talents, and with the ſofteſt and moſt pathetic expoſtulations in favour of union and concord in an afflicted and divided church; all which MILTITZ joined together with the greateſt dexterity and addreſs, in order to touch and diſarm the Saxon reformer. Nor were his mild and inſinuating methods of negociating without effect; and it was upon this occaſion that LUTHER made ſubmiſſions which ſhewed that his views were not, as yet, very extenſive, his former prejudices entirely expelled, or his reforming principles ſteadily fixed. For he not only offered to obſerve a profound ſilence for the future with reſpect to indulgences, provided the ſame condition were impoſed on his adverſaries; he went much farther; he propoſed writing an humble and ſubmiſſive letter to the pope, acknowledging that he had carried his zeal and animoſity too far; and ſuch a letter he wrote ſome time after the conference at *Altenburg* [z]. He even conſented to publiſh a

---

☞ [z] This letter was dated the 13th of March, 1519, about two months after the conference of *Altenburg*.

circular letter, exhorting all his diſciples and followers to reverence and obey the dictates of the holy Roman church. He declared, that his only intention, in the writings he had compoſed, was to brand with infamy thoſe emiſſaries who abuſed its authority, and employed its protection as a maſk to cover their abominable and impious frauds. It is true, indeed, that amidſt thoſe weak ſubmiſſions which the impartial demands of hiſtorical truth oblige us to relate, there was, properly ſpeaking, no retraction of his former tenets, nor the ſmalleſt degree of reſpect ſhewn to the infamous traffic of indulgences. Nevertheleſs, the pretended majeſty of the Roman church, and the authority of the Roman pontif, were treated by LUTHER in this tranſaction, and in his letter to LEO, in a manner that could not naturally have been expected from a man who had already appealed from the pope to a general council.

Had the court of *Rome* been prudent enough to have accepted of the ſubmiſſion made by LUTHER, they would have almoſt nipped in the bud the cauſe of the reformation, or would, at leaſt, have conſiderably retarded its growth and progreſs. Having gained over the head, the members would, with greater facility, have been reduced to obedience. But the flaming and exceſſive zeal of ſome inconſiderate bigots renewed, happily for the truth, the diviſions, which were ſo near being healed, and, by animating both LUTHER and his followers to look deeper into the enormities that prevailed in the papal hierarchy, promoted the principles, and augmented the ſpirit, which produced, at length, the bleſſed [a] reformation.

X. One

☞ [a] See, for an ample account of LUTHER's conferences with MILTITZ, the incomparable work of SECKENDORF, intituled, *Commentar. Hiſtor. Apologet. de Lutheraniſmo, ſive de Reformatione Religionis*, &c. in which the facts relating to LUTHER and the Reformation are deduced from the moſt precious and authentic

The diſputes at *Leipſic* in the year 1519, between Eckius and Carloſtadt.

X. One of the circumſtances that contributed principally, at leaſt by its conſequences, to render the embaſſy of Miltitz ineffectual for the reſtoration of peace, was a famous controverſy of an incidental nature that was carried on at *Leipſic*, ſome weeks ſucceſſively, in the year 1519 [*b*]. A doctor named Eckius, who was one of the moſt eminent and zealous champions in the papal cauſe, happened to differ widely from Carlostadt, the colleague and companion of Luther, in his ſentiments concerning *Free-will*. The reſult of this variety in opinion was eaſy to be foreſeen. The military genius of our anceſtors had ſo far infected the ſchools of learning, that differences in points of religion or literature, when they grew to a certain degree of warmth and animoſity, were decided, like the quarrels of valiant knights, by a ſingle combat. Some famous univerſity was pitched upon as the field of battle, while the rector and profeſſors beheld the conteſt, and proclaimed the victory. Eckius, therefore, in compliance with the ſpirit of this fighting age, challenged Carlostadt, and even Luther himſelf, againſt whom he had already drawn his pen, to try the force of his theological arms. The challenge was accepted, the day appointed, and the three champions appeared in the field. The firſt conflict was between Carlostadt and

---

authentic manuſcripts and records, contained in the library of *Saxe-Gotha*, and in other learned and princely collections, and in which the frauds and falſehoods of Maimbourg's *Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm* are fully detected and refuted.—As to Miltitz, his fate was unhappy. His moderation (which nothing but the blind zeal of ſome furious monks could have hindered from being eminently ſerviceable to the cauſe of *Rome)* was repreſented by Eckius, as ſomething worſe than indifference about the ſucceſs of his commiſſion; and, after ſeveral marks of neglect received from the pontif, he had the misfortune to loſe his life in paſſing the *Rhine* at *Mentz*.

[*b*] Theſe diſputes commenced on the 25th of June, and ended on the 15th of July following.

ECKIUS concerning the powers and freedom of the human will [c]; it was carried on in the caſtle of *Pleiſſenburg*, in preſence of a numerous and ſplendid audience, and was followed by a diſpute between LUTHER and ECKIUS concerning the authority and ſupremacy of the Roman pontif. This latter controverſy, which the preſent ſituation of affairs rendered ſingularly nice and critical, was left undecided. Hoffman, at that time rector of the univerſity of *Leipſic*, and who had been alſo appointed judge of the arguments alleged on both ſides, refuſed to declare to whom the victory belonged; ſo that the deciſion of this matter was referred to the univerſities of *Paris* and *Erfurt* [d]. In the mean time, one of the immediate effects of this diſpute was a viſible increaſe of the bitterneſs and enmity which ECKIUS had conceived againſt LUTHER; for from this very period he breathed nothing but fury againſt the Saxon reformer [e], whom he marked out as a victim

---

☞ [c] This controverſy turned upon *liberty*, conſidered not in a philoſophical, but in a theological ſenſe. It was rather a diſpute concerning *power* than concerning *liberty*. CARLOSTADT maintained, that, ſince the fall of man, our natural liberty is not ſtrong enough to conduct us to what is good, without the intervention of divine grace. ECKIUS aſſerted, on the contrary, that our natural liberty co-operated with divine grace, and that it was in the power of man to conſent to the divine impulſe, or to reſiſt it. The former attributed all to God; the latter divided the merit of virtue between God and the creature. The modern *Lutherans* have almoſt univerſally abandoned the ſentiments of CARLOSTADT.

[d] There is an ample account of this diſpute at *Leipſic* given by VAL. ERN. LOSCHERUS, in his *Acta et Documenta Reformationis*, tom. iii. c. vii. p. 203.

☞ [e] This was one proof that the iſſue of the controverſy was not in his favour. The victor, in any combat, is generally too full of ſatisfaction and ſelf-complacency, to feel the emotions of fury and vengeance, which ſeldom ariſe but from diſappointment and defeat. There is even an inſolent kind of clemency that ariſes from an eminent and palpable ſuperiority. This indeed ECKIUS had no opportunity of exerciſing. LUTHER victim to his vengeance, without conſidering, that the meaſures he took for the deſtruction of Luther, muſt have a moſt pernicious influence upon the cauſe of the Roman pontif, by fomenting the preſent diviſions, and thus contributing to the progreſs of the reformation, as was really the caſe [e].

Philip Melancthon.

XI. Among the ſpectators of this eccleſiaſtical combat was Philip Melancthon, at that time, profeſſor of Greek at *Wittemberg*, who had not, as yet, been involved in theſe diviſions (as indeed the mildneſs of his temper and his elegant taſte for polite literature rendered him averſe from diſputes of this nature), though he was the intimate friend of Luther, and approved his deſign of delivering the pure and primitive ſcience of theology from the darkneſs and ſubtilty of ſcholaſtic jargon [f]. As this eminent man was one of thoſe, whom this diſpute with Eckius convinced of the excellence of Luther's cauſe; as he was, more-

---

Luther demonſtrated, in this conference, that the church of *Rome*, in the earlier ages, had never been acknowledged as ſuperior to other churches, and combated the pretenſions of that church and its biſhop, from the teſtimony of ſcripture, the authority of the fathers, and the beſt eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians; and even from the decrees of the council of *Nice*; while all the arguments of Eckius were derived from the ſpurious and inſipid *Decretals*, which were ſcarcely of 400 years ſtanding. See Seckendorff's *Hiſt. of Lutheraniſm*.

☞ [e] It may be obſerved here, that, before Luther's attack upon the ſtore-houſe of indulgences, Eckius was his intimate friend. Eckius muſt certainly been uncommonly unworthy, ſince even the mild and gentle Melancthon repreſents him as an *inhuman perſecutor*, a *ſophiſt*, and a *knave*, who maintained doctrines contrary to his belief and againſt his conſcience. See the learned Dr. Jortin's *Life of Eraſmus*, vol. ii. p. 713; ſee alſo Vitus's account of the death of Eckius in Seckendorff, lib. iii. p. 468; and in the *Scholia ad Indicem* 1 Hiſt. of the ſame book, No. xxiii.

[f] See Melancthon's Letter concerning the conference at *Leipſic*, in Loscher's *Acta et Documenta Reformationis*, tom. iii. cap. viii. p. 215; as alſo in the *Wittemberg* edition of Luther's Works, vol. i. p. 336.

over, one of the illuſtrious and reſpectable inſtruments of the Reformation; it may not be improper to give ſome account here of the talents and virtues that have rendered his name immortal. His greateſt enemies have borne teſtimony to his merit. They have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibit very few worthies that may be compared with him; whether we conſider the extent of his knowledge in things human and divine, the fertility and elegance of his genius, the facility and quickneſs of his comprehenſion, or the uninterrupted induſtry that attended his learned and theological labours. He rendered to philoſophy and the liberal arts the ſame eminent ſervice that LUTHER had done to religion, by purging them from the droſs with which they had been corrupted, and by recommending them, in a powerful and perſuaſive manner, to the ſtudy of the Germans. He had the rare talent of diſcerning truth in all its moſt intricate connexions and combinations, of comprehending at once the moſt abſtract notions, and expreſſing them with the utmoſt perſpicuity and eaſe. And he applied this happy talent in religious diſquiſitions with ſuch unparalleled ſucceſs, that it may ſafely be affirmed, that the cauſe of true Chriſtianity derived from the learning and genius of MELANCTHON more ſignal advantages, and a more effectual ſupport, than it received from any of the other doctors of the age. His love of peace and concord, which was partly owing to the ſweetneſs of his natural temper, made him deſire with ardour that a reformation might be effected without producing a ſchiſm in the church, and that the external communion of the contending parties might be preſerved uninterrupted and entire. This ſpirit of mildneſs and charity, carried perhaps too far, led him ſometimes to make conceſſions that were neither conſiſtent with prudence,

dence, nor advantageous to the cauſe in which he was engaged. It is however certain, that he gave no quarter to thoſe more dangerous and momentous errors that reigned in the church of *Rome*; but maintained, on the contrary, that their extirpation was eſſentially neceſſary, in order to the reſtoration of true religion. In the natural complexion of this great man there was ſomething ſoft, timorous, and yielding. Hence aroſe a certain diffidence of himſelf, that not only made him examine things with the greateſt attention and care, before he reſolved upon any meaſure, but alſo filled him with uneaſy apprehenſions where there was no danger, and made him fear even things that, in reality, could never happen. And yet, on the other hand, when the hour of real danger approached, when things bore a formidable aſpect, and the cauſe of religion was in imminent peril, then this timorous man was converted, all at once, into an intrepid hero, looked danger in the face with unſhaken conſtancy, and oppoſed his adverſaries with invincible fortitude. All this ſhews, that the force of truth and the power of principle had diminiſhed the weakneſſes and defects of MELANCTHON's natural character without entirely removing them. Had his fortitude been more uniform and ſteady, his deſire of reconciling all intereſts and pleaſing all parties leſs vehement and exceſſive, his triumph over the ſuperſtitions imbibed in his infancy more complete [g], he muſt deſervedly have been conſidered as one of the greateſt among men [h].

XII. While

☞ [g] By this, no doubt, Dr. MOSHEIM means the credulity this great man diſcovered with reſpect to prodigies and dreams, and his having been ſomewhat addicted to the pretended ſcience of aſtrology. See SCHELHORNII *Amœnit. Hiſt. Eccleſ. et Lit.* vol. ii. p. 609.

[h] We have a Life of MELANCTHON, written by JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, which has already gone through ſeveral editions.

The origin of the reformation in *Switzerland.*

XII. While the credit, and authority of the Roman pontif were thus upon the decline in *Germany*, they received a mortal wound in *Switzerland* from ULRIC ZUINGLE, a canon of *Zurich*, whoſe extenſive learning and uncommon ſagacity were accompanied with the moſt heroic intrepidity and reſolution [*i*]. It muſt even be acknowledged [*k*], that this eminent man had perceived ſome rays of the truth before* LUTHER came to an open rupture with the church of

---

tions. But a more accurate account of this illuſtrious reformer, compoſed by a prudent, impartial, and well informed biographer, as alſo a complete collection of his *Works*, would be an ineſtimable preſent to the republic of letters.

☞ [*i*] The tranſlator has added, to the portrait of ZUINGLE, the quality of *heroic intrepidity*, becauſe it was a predominant and remarkable part of the character of this illuſtrious reformer, whoſe learning and fortitude, tempered by the greateſt moderation, rendered him perhaps beyond compariſon the brighteſt ornament of the proteſtant cauſe.

☞ [*k*] Our learned hiſtorian does not ſeem to acknowledge this with pleaſure, as the Germans and Swiſs contend about the honour of having given the firſt overtures towards the Reformation. If, however, truth has obliged him to make this acknowledgment, he has accompanied it with ſome modifications, that are more artful than accurate. He ſays, "that ZUINGLE *had perceived ſome rays of the truth before* LUTHER *had come to an open rupture*," &c. to make us imagine that LUTHER might have ſeen the truth long before that rupture happened, and conſequently as ſoon as ZUINGLE. But it is well known, that the latter, from his early years, had been ſhocked at ſeveral of the ſuperſtitious practices of the church of *Rome*: that ſo early as the year 1516 *, he had begun to explain the ſcriptures to the people, and to cenſure, though with great prudence and moderation, the errors of a corrupt church; and that he had very noble and extenſive ideas of a general reformation, at the very time that LUTHER retained almoſt the whole ſyſtem of popery, indulgences excepted. LUTHER proceeded very ſlowly to that exemption from the prejudices of education, which ZUINGLE, by the force of an adventurous genius, and an uncommon degree of knowledge and penetration, eaſily got rid of.

---

* RUCHART, *Hiſt. de la Réformation en Suiſſe.* ZUINGLII *Opp.* tom. i. p. 7. *Nouveau Diction.* vol. iv. p. 866. DURAND, *Hiſt.* du xvi. Siecle, tom. ii. p. 8, &c. JURIEU, *Apologie pour les Reformateurs*, &c. partie I. p. 119.

Rome. He was however afterwards ſtill farther animated by the example, and inſtructed by the writings of the Saxon reformer; and thus his zeal for the good cauſe acquired new ſtrength and vigour. For he not only explained the ſacred writings in his public diſcourſes to the people [l], but alſo gave in the year 1519, a ſignal proof of his courage, by oppoſing, with the greateſt reſolution and ſucceſs, the miniſtry of a certain Italian monk, whoſe name was SAMSON, and who was carrying on, in *Switzerland*, the impious traffic of Indulgences with the ſame impudence that TETZEL had done in *Germany* [m]. This was the firſt remarkable event that prepared the way for the reformation among the Helvetic cantons. In proceſs of time, ZUINGLE purſued with ſteadineſs and reſolution the deſign that he had begun with ſuch courage and ſucceſs. His noble efforts were ſeconded by ſome other learned men, educated in *Germany*, who became his colleagues and the companions of his labours, and who jointly with him ſucceeded ſo far in removing the credulity of a deluded people, that the pope's ſupremacy was rejected and denied in the greateſt part of *Switzerland*. It is indeed to be obſerved, that ZUINGLE did not always uſe the ſame methods of converſion that were employed by LUTHER; nor, upon par-

---

☞ [l] This again is inaccurate. It appears from the preceding note, and from the moſt authentic records of hiſtory, that ZUINGLE had explained the ſcriptures to the people, and called in queſtion the authority and ſupremacy of the pope, before the name of LUTHER was known in *Switzerland*. Beſides, inſtead of receiving inſtruction from the German reformer, he was much his ſuperior in learning, capacity, and judgment, and was much fitter to be his *maſter* than his *diſciple*, as the four volumes, in folio, we have of his works, abundantly teſtify.

[m] See JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Helvet.* tom. ii. lib. vi. p. 28.—RUCHAT, *Hiſtoire de la Reformation en Suiſſe*, tom. i. livr. i. p. 4.—66.—GERDES, *Hiſtor. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii. p. 228.

ticular occaſions, did he diſcountenance the uſe of violent meaſures againſt ſuch as adhered with obſtinacy to the ſuperſtitions of their anceſtors. He is alſo ſaid to have attributed to the civil magiſtrate, ſuch an extenſive power in eccleſiaſtical affairs, as is quite inconſiſtent with the eſſence and genius of religion. But, upon the whole, even envy itſelf muſt acknowledge, that his intentions were upright, and his deſigns worthy of the higheſt approbation.

Luther is excommunicated by the pope, in 1520.

XIII. In the mean time, the religious diſſenſions in *Germany* increaſed, inſtead of diminiſhing. For while MILTITZ was treating with LUTHER in *Saxony*, in ſuch a mild and prudent manner as offered the faireſt proſpect of an approaching accommodation, ECKIUS, inflamed with reſentment and fury on account of his defeat at *Leipſic*, repaired with the utmoſt precipitation to *Rome*, to accompliſh, as he imagined, the ruin of LUTHER. There, entering into a league with the Dominicans, who were in high credit at the papal court, and more eſpecially with their two zealous patrons, DE PRIERIO and CAJETAN, he earneſtly entreated LEO X. to level the thunder of his *anathemas* at the head of LUTHER, and to exclude him from the communion of the church. The Dominicans, deſirous of revenging the affront that, in their opinion, their whole order had received by LUTHER's treatment of their brother TETZEL, and their patron CAJETAN, ſeconded the furious efforts of ECKIUS againſt the Saxon reformer, and uſed their utmoſt endeavours to have his requeſt granted. The pontif, overcome by the importunity of theſe pernicious counſellors, imprudently iſſued [*n*] out a bull againſt LUTHER, dated the 15th of June, 1520,

---

[*n*] The wiſeſt and beſt part of the Roman-catholics acknowledge, that LEO X. was chargeable with the moſt culpable imprudence in this raſh and violent method of proceeding. See

1520, in which forty-one pretended hereſies, extracted from his writings, were ſolemnly condemned, his writings ordered to be publicly burnt, and in which he was again ſummoned, on pain of excommunication, to confeſs and retract his pretended errors within the ſpace of ſixty days, and to caſt himſelf upon the clemency and mercy of the pontif.

Luther withdraws himſelf from the communion of the church of Rome.

XIV. As ſoon as the account of this raſh ſentence, pronounced from the papal chair, was brought to LUTHER, he thought it was high time to conſult both his preſent defence and his future ſecurity; and the firſt ſtep he took for this purpoſe, was the renewal of his appeal from the ſentence of the Roman pontif, to the more reſpectable deciſion of a general council. But as he foreſaw that this appeal would be treated with contempt at the court of *Rome*, and that when the time preſcribed for his recantation was elapſed, the thunder of excommunication would be levelled at his devoted head, he judged it prudent to withdraw himſelf voluntarily from the communion of the church of *Rome*, before he was obliged to leave it by force; and thus to render this new bull of ejection a blow in the air, an exerciſe of authority without any object to act upon. At the ſame time, he was reſolved to execute this wiſe reſolution in a public manner, that his voluntary retreat from the communion of a corrupt and ſuperſtitious

---

See a Diſſertation of the learned JOHN FREDERICK MAYER, *De Pontificiis Leonis X. proceſſum adverſus Lutherum improbantibus*, which is part of a work he publiſhed at *Hamburg*, in 4to, in the year 1698, under this ſingular title: *Eccleſia Romana Reformationis Lutheranæ patrona et cliens*. There were ſeveral wiſe and thinking perſons at this time about the Roman pontif, who declared openly, without the leaſt ceremony, their diſapprobation of the violent counſels of ECKIUS and the *Dominicans*; and gave it as their opinion, that it was both prudent and juſt to wait for the iſſue of the conferences of MILTITZ with LUTHER, before ſuch forcible meaſures were employed.

perſtitious church might be univerſally known, before the lordly pontif had prepared his ghoſtly thunder. With this view, on the 10th of December, in the year 1520, he had a pile of wood erected without the walls of the city [*o*], and there, in preſence of a prodigious multitude of people of all ranks and orders, he committed to the flames both the *bull* that had been publiſhed againſt him, and the decretals and canons relating to the pope's ſupreme juriſdiction. By this he declared to the world, that he was no longer a ſubject of the Roman pontif; and that, of conſequence, the ſentence of excommunication againſt him, which was daily expected from *Rome*, was entirely ſuperfluous and inſignificant. For the man who publicly commits to the flames the *code* that contains the laws of his ſovereign, ſhews thereby that he has no longer any reſpect for his government, nor any deſign to ſubmit to his authority; and the man who voluntarily withdraws himſelf from any ſociety, cannot, with any appearance of reaſon or common ſenſe, be afterwards forcibly and authoritatively excluded from it. It is not improbable, that LUTHER was directed, in this critical meaſure, by perſons well ſkilled in the law, who are generally dextrous in furniſhing a perplexed client with nice diſtinctions and plauſible evaſions. Be that as it may, he ſeparated himſelf only from the church of *Rome*, which conſiders the pope as infallible, and not from the church, conſidered in a more extenſive ſenſe; for he ſubmitted to the deciſion of the univerſal church, when that deciſion ſhould be given in a general council lawfully aſſembled. When this judicious diſtinction is conſidered, it will not appear at all ſurpriſing, that many, even of the Roman catholics, who weighed matters with a certain degree of impartiality and wiſdom, and were zealous for the maintenance of the liberties of *Germany*, juſtified this bold reſolution of LUTHER [*o*]. In leſs than a month after this noble and important ſtep had been taken by the Saxon reformer, a ſecond *bull* was iſſued out againſt him, on the 6th of January, 1521, by which he was expelled from the communion of the church, for having inſulted the majeſty, and diſowned the ſupremacy, of the Roman pontif [*p*].

[*o*] Of *Wittemberg*.

The riſe of the Lutheran church.

XV. Such iniquitous laws, enacted againſt the perſon and doctrine of LUTHER, produced an effect different from what was expected by the imperious pontif. Inſtead of intimidating this bold reformer, they led him to form the project of founding a church upon principles entirely oppoſite to thoſe of *Rome*, and to eſtabliſh, in it, a ſyſtem of doctrine and eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, agreeable to the ſpirit and precepts of the Goſpel of truth. This, indeed, was the only reſource LUTHER had left him; for to ſubmit to the orders of a cruel and inſolent enemy, would have been the greateſt degree of imprudence imaginable; and to embrace, anew, errors that he had rejected with a juſt indignation, and expoſed with the cleareſt evidence, would have diſcovered a want of integrity and principle, worthy only of the moſt abandoned

---

☞ [*o*] This judicious diſtinction has not been ſufficiently attended to, and the Romaniſts, ſome through artifice, others through ignorance, have confounded the *papacy* with the *catholic church*; though they be, in reality, two different things. The papacy indeed, by the ambitious dexterity of the Roman pontifs, incorporated itſelf by degrees into the church; but it was a prepoſterous ſupplement, and was really as foreign to its genuine conſtitution, as a new *citadel erected*, by a ſucceſsful uſurper, would be to an *ancient city*. LUTHER ſet out and acted upon this diſtinction; he went out of the *citadel*, but he meant to remain in the *city*, and, like a good patriot, deſigned to reform its corrupted government.

[*p*] Both theſe *bulls* are to be found in the *Bullarium Romanum*, and alſo in the learned PFAFF's *Hiſtor. Theol. Literar.* tom. ii. p. 42.

abandoned profligate. From this time, therefore, he applied himſelf to the purſuit of the truth with ſtill more aſſiduity and fervour than he had formerly done; nor did he only review with attention, and confirm by new arguments, what he had hitherto taught, but went much beyond it, and made vigorous attacks upon the main ſtrong-hold of popery, the power and juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, which he overturned from its very foundation. In this noble undertaking he was ſeconded by many learned and pious men, in various parts of *Europe*; by thoſe of the profeſſors of the academy of *Wittemberg*, who had adopted his principles; and in a more eſpecial manner by the celebrated MELANCTHON. And as the fame of LUTHER'S wiſdom and MELANCTHON'S learning had filled that academy with an incredible number of ſtudents, who flocked to it from all parts, this happy circumſtance propagated the principles of the Reformation with an amazing rapidity through all the countries of *Europe* [q].

A diet aſſembled at *Worms* in 1521.

XVI. Not long after the commencement of theſe diviſions, MAXIMILIAN I. had departed this life, and his grandſon CHARLES V., king of *Spain*, had ſucceeded him in the empire in the year 1519. LEO X. ſeized this new occaſion of venting and executing his vengeance, by putting the new emperor in mind of his character as *advocate and defender of the church*, and demanding the exemplary puniſhment of LUTHER, who had rebelled againſt its ſacred laws and inſtitutions. On the other hand, FREDERICK the *Wiſe* employed his credit with CHARLES to prevent the publication of any unjuſt edict againſt this reformer, and to have his cauſe tried by the canons of the Germanic church, and the laws of the empire. This requeſt was ſo much the more likely to be granted, that CHARLES was under much greater obligations to FREDERICK, than to any other of the German princes, as it was chiefly by his zealous and important ſervices that he had been raiſed to the empire, in oppoſition to the pretenſions of ſuch a formidable rival as FRANCIS I., king of *France*. The emperor was ſenſible of his obligations to the worthy elector, and was entirely diſpoſed to ſatisfy his demands. That, however, he might do this without diſpleaſing the Roman pontif, he reſolved that LUTHER ſhould be called before the council, that was to be aſſembled at *Worms* in the year 1521, and that his cauſe ſhould be there publicly heard, before any final ſentence ſhould be pronounced againſt him. It may perhaps appear ſtrange, and even inconſiſtent with the laws of the church, that a cauſe of a religious nature ſhould be examined and decided in the public diet. But it muſt be conſidered, that theſe diets, in which the archbiſhops, biſhops, and even certain abbots, had their places, as well as the princes of the empire, were not only political aſſemblies, but alſo provincial councils for *Germany*, to whoſe juriſdiction, by the ancient canon law, ſuch cauſes as that of LUTHER properly belonged.

---

[q] There is a particular account of the rapid progreſs of the reformation in *Germany* given by the learned M. DANIEL GERDES, profeſſor at *Groningen*, in his *Hiſtoria renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii.

The reſult of this diet, *Luther's* baniſhment.

XVII. LUTHER, therefore, appeared at *Worms*, ſecured againſt the violence of his enemies by a ſafe-conduct from the emperor, and, on the 17th of April, and the day following, pleaded his cauſe before that grand aſſembly with the utmoſt reſolution and preſence of mind. The united power of threatenings and entreaties were employed to conquer the firmneſs of his purpoſe, to engage him to renounce the propoſitions he had hitherto maintained, and to bend him to a ſubmiſſion to the Roman pontif. But he refuſed all this with a noble obſtinacy, and declared ſolemnly, that he would neither abandon his opinions, nor change his conduct, until he was previouſly convinced, by the word of God, or the dictates of right reaſon, that his opinions were erroneous, and his conduct unlawful. When therefore neither promiſes nor threatenings could ſhake the conſtancy of this magnanimous reformer, he obtained, indeed, from the emperor the liberty of returning, unmoleſted, to his home; but after his departure from the diet, he was condemned by the unanimous ſuffrages both of the emperor and the princes, and was declared an enemy to the holy Roman empire [r]. FREDERICK,

---

☞ [r] This ſentence, which was dated the 8th of May, 1521, was exceſſively ſevere; and CHARLES V., whether through ſincere zeal or political cunning, ſhewed himſelf in this affair an ardent abettor of the papal authority. For in this edict the pope is declared the only true judge of the controverſy, in which he was evidently the party concerned; LUTHER is declared a *member cut off from the church*, a *ſchiſmatic*, a *notorious* and *obſtinate heretic*; the ſevereſt puniſhments are denounced againſt thoſe, who ſhall *receive*, *entertain*, *maintain*, or *countenance* him, either by acts of hoſpitality, by converſation or writing; and all his diſciples, adherents, and followers, are involved in the ſame condemnation. This *edict* was, however, received with the higheſt diſapprobation by all wiſe and thinking perſons, *1ſt*, becauſe LUTHER had been condemned without being heard, at *Rome*, by the college of cardinals, and afterwards at *Worms*, where, without either examining or refuting his doctrine, he was only deſpotically ordered to abandon and renounce it; *2dly*, becauſe CHARLES V., as emperor, had not a right to give an authoritative ſentence againſt the doctrine of LUTHER, nor to take for granted the *infallibility* of the Roman pontif, before theſe matters were diſcuſſed and decided by a general council; and 3*dly*, becauſe a conſiderable number of the German princes, who were immediately intereſted in this affair, ſuch as the electors of *Cologn*, *Saxony*, and the *Palatinate*, and other ſovereign princes, had neither been preſent at the diet, nor examined and approved the *edict*; and that, therefore, at beſt, it could only have force in the territories belonging to the houſe of *Auſtria*, and to ſuch of the princes as had given their conſent to its publication. But after all, the edict of *Worms* produced almoſt no effect, not only for the reaſons now mentioned, but alſo becauſe CHARLES V., whoſe preſence, authority, and zeal, were neceſſary to render it

FREDERICK, who ſaw the ſtorm riſing againſt LUTHER, uſed the beſt precautions to ſecure him from its violence. For this purpoſe he ſent three or four perſons, in whom he could confide, to meet him on his return from the diet, in order to conduct him to a place of ſafety. Theſe emiſſaries, diſguiſed by maſks, executed their commiſſion with the utmoſt ſecrecy and ſucceſs. Meeting with LUTHER, near *Eyſenac*, they ſeized him, and carried him into the caſtle of *Wartenberg*, nor, as ſome have imagined upon probable grounds, was this done without the knowledge of his Imperial majeſty. In this retreat, which he called his *Patmos*, the Saxon reformer lay concealed during the ſpace of ten months, and employed this involuntary leiſure in compoſitions that were afterwards uſeful to the world [*s*].

XVIII. The

---

it reſpectable, was involved in other affairs of a civil nature, which he had more at heart. Obliged to paſs ſucceſſively into *Flanders*, *England*, and *Spain*, to quell the ſeditions of his ſubjects, and to form new alliances againſt his great enemy and rival FRANCIS I., he loſt ſight of the *edict* of *Worms*, while all who had any regard to the liberties of the empire and the rights of the Germanic church treated this edict with the higheſt indignation, or the utmoſt contempt.

☞ [*s*] This precaution of the humane and excellent elector, being put in execution the 3d of May, five days before the ſolemn publication of the edict of *Worms*, the pope miſſed his blow; and the adverſaries of LUTHER became doubly odious to the people in *Germany*, who, unacquainted with the ſcheme of FREDERICK, and, not knowing what was become of their favourite reformer, imagined he was impriſoned, or perhaps deſtroyed, by the emiſſaries of *Rome*. In the mean time, LUTHER lived in peace and quiet in the caſtle of *Wartenberg*, where he tranſlated a great part of the *New Teſtament* into the German language, and wrote frequent letters to his truſty friends and intimates to comfort them under his abſence. Nor was his confinement here inconſiſtent with amuſement and relaxation; for he enjoyed frequently the pleaſure of hunting in company with his keepers, paſſing for a country gentleman, under the name of *Yonker George*.

☞ If we caſt an eye upon the conduct of LUTHER, in this firſt ſcene of his trials, we ſhall find a true ſpirit of rational

zeal,

The conduct of Luther after his leaving the caſtle of *Wartenberg.*

XVIII. The active ſpirit of LUTHER could not, however, long bear this confinement; he therefore left his *Patmos* in the month of March, of the year 1522, without the conſent, or even the knowledge, of his patron and protector FREDERICK, and repaired to *Wittemberg*. One of the principal motives that engaged him to take this bold ſtep, was the information he had received of the inconſiderate conduct of CARLOSTADT, and ſome other friends of the Reformation, who had already excited

zeal, generous probity, and Chriſtian fortitude, animating this reformer. In his behaviour, before and at the diet of *Worms*, we obſerve theſe qualities ſhine with a peculiar luſtre, and tempered, notwithſtanding LUTHER's warm complexion, with an unexpected degree of moderation and decent reſpect both for his civil and eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors. When ſome of his friends, informed of the violent deſigns of the Roman court, and alarmed by the *bull* that had been publiſhed againſt him by the raſh pontif, adviſed him not to expoſe his perſon at the diet of *Worms*, notwithſtanding the imperial ſafe-conduct (which, in a ſimilar caſe, had not been ſufficient to protect JOHN HUSS and JEROME of *Prague* from the perfidy and cruelty of their enemies), he anſwered with his uſual intrepidity, that *were he obliged to encounter at* Worms *as many devils as there were tiles upon the houſes of that city, this would not deter him from his fixed purpoſe of appearing there*; that *fear, in his caſe, could be only a ſuggeſtion of Satan, who apprehended the approaching ruin of his kingdom, and who was willing to avoid a public defeat before ſuch a grand aſſembly as the diet of* Worms. The fire and obſtinacy that appeared in this anſwer ſeemed to prognoſticate much warmth and vehemence in LUTHER's conduct at the aſſembly before which he was going to appear. But it was quite otherwiſe. He expoſed with decency and dignity the ſuperſtitious doctrines and practices of the church of *Rome*, and the grievances that aroſe from the over-grown power of its pontif, and the abuſe that was made of it. He acknowledged the writings with which he was charged, and offered, both with moderation and humility, to defend their contents. He deſired the pope's legates and their adherents to hear him, to inform him, to reaſon with him; and ſolemnly offered, in preſence of the aſſembled princes and biſhops, to renounce his doctrines, if they were ſhown to be erroneous. But to all theſe expoſtulations he received no other anſwer, than the deſpotic dictates of mere authority, attended with injurious and provoking language.

cited tumults in *Saxony*, and were acting in a manner equally prejudicial to the tranquillity of the ſtate, and the true intereſts of the church. CARLOSTADT, profeſſor at *Wittemberg*, was a man of conſiderable learning, who had pierced the veil, with which papal artifice and ſuperſtition had covered the truth, and, at the inſtigation of ECKIUS, had been excluded with LUTHER from the communion of the church. His zeal, however, was intemperate; his plans laid with temerity, and executed without moderation. During LUTHER's abſence, he threw down and broke the images of the ſaints that were placed in the churches, and inſtead of reſtraining the vehemence of a fanatical multitude, who had already begun in ſome places to abuſe the precious liberty that was dawning upon them, he encouraged their ill-timed violence, and led them on to ſedition and mutiny. LUTHER oppoſed the impetuoſity of this imprudent reformer with the utmoſt fortitude and dignity, and wiſely exhorted him and his adherents firſt to eradicate error from the minds of the people, before they made war upon its external enſigns in the churches and public places; ſince, the former being once removed, the latter muſt fall of courſe [t], and ſince the deſtruction of

---

☞ [t] Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter is perhaps more advantageous to LUTHER than the rigorous demands of hiſtorical impartiality will admit of; the defects at leaſt of the great reformer are here ſhaded with art. It is evident from ſeveral paſſages in the writings of LUTHER, that he was by no means averſe to the uſe of images, but that, on the contrary, he looked upon them as adapted to excite and animate the devotion of the people. But, perhaps the true reaſon of LUTHER's diſpleaſure at the proceedings of CARLOSTADT, was, that he could not bear to ſee another crowned with the glory of executing a plan which he had laid; and that he was ambitious of appearing the principal, if not the only, conductor of this great work. This is not a mere conjecture. LUTHER himſelf has not taken the leaſt pains to conceal this inſtance of his ambition;

of the latter alone could be attended with no laſting fruits. To theſe prudent admonitions this excellent reformer added the influence of example, by applying himſelf with redoubled induſtry and zeal, to his German tranſlation of the Holy Scriptures, which he carried on with expedition and ſucceſs [u], with the aſſiſtance of ſome learned and pious men, whom he conſulted in this great and important undertaking. The event abundantly ſhewed the wiſdom of LUTHER's advice. For the different parts of this tranſlation, being ſucceſſively and gradually ſpread abroad among the people, produced ſudden and almoſt incredible effects, and extirpated, root and branch, the erroneous principles and ſuperſtitious doctrines of the church of *Rome* from the minds of a prodigious number of perſons.

Leo X. ſucceeded by Adrian VI. in the year 1522. Diet of *Nuremberg.*

XIX. While theſe things were tranſacting, LEO X. departed this life, and was ſucceeded in the pontificate by ADRIAN VI., a native of *Utrecht.* This pope, who had formerly been preceptor to CHARLES V., and who owed his new dignity to the good offices of that prince, was a man of probity and candor, who acknowledged ingenuouſly that the church laboured under the moſt fatal diſ-

---

ambition; and it appears evidently in ſeveral of his letters. On the other hand, it muſt be owned, that CARLOSTADT was raſh, violent, and prone to enthuſiaſm, as appears by the connexions he formed afterwards with the fanatical anabaptiſts, headed by MUNZER. His conteſts with LUTHER about the euchariſt, in which he manifeſtly maintained the truth, ſhall be mentioned in their proper place.

[u] On this *German tranſlation of the Bible,* which contributed more than all other cauſes, taken together, to ſtrengthen the foundations of the Lutheran church, we have an intereſting hiſtory compoſed by JO. FRID. MAYER, and publiſhed in 4to at *Hamburg,* in the year 1701. A more ample one, however, was expected from the labours of the learned J. MELCHIOR KRAFT, but his death has diſappointed our hopes. See JO. ALB. FABRICII *Centifolium Lutheran.* par. I. p. 147. & par. II. p. 617.

orders, and declared his willingneſs to apply the remedies that ſhould be judged the moſt adapted to heal them [w]. He began his pontificate by ſending a legate to the diet, which was aſſembled at *Nuremberg* in 1522. FRANCIS CHEREGATO, the perſon who was intruſted with this commiſſion, had poſitive orders to demand the ſpeedy and vigorous execution of the ſentence that had been pronounced againſt LUTHER and his followers at the diet of *Worms*; but, at the ſame time, he was authoriſed to declare that the pontif was ready to remove the abuſes and grievances that had armed ſuch a formidable enemy againſt the ſee of *Rome*. The princes of the empire, encouraged by this declaration on the one hand, and by the abſence of the emperor, who, at this time, reſided in *Spain*, on the other, ſeized this opportunity of propoſing the ſummoning a general council in *Germany*, in order to deliberate upon the proper methods of bringing about an univerſal reformation of the church. They exhibited, at the ſame time, an hundred articles, containing the heavieſt complaints of the injurious treatment the Germans had hitherto received from the court of *Rome*, and, by a public law, prohibited all innovation in religious matters, until a general council ſhould decide what was to be done in an affair of ſuch high moment and importance [x]. As long as the German princes were unacquainted with, or inattentive to, the meaſures that were taken in *Saxony* for founding a new church in direct oppoſition to that of *Rome*, they were zealouſly unanimous in their endeavours to ſet bounds to the papal authority and juriſdiction, which they all looked upon as overgrown and enormous; nor were they at all offended at LUTHER's conteſt with the Roman pontif, which they conſidered as a diſpute of a private and perſonal nature.

---

[w] See CASPAR. BURMANNI *Adrianus* VI., *ſive Analecta Hiſtorica de Adriano* VI. *Papa Romano*, publiſhed at *Utrecht* in 4to, in the year 1727.

[x] See JAC. FRID. GEORGII *Gravamina Germanorum adverſus Sedem Romanam*, lib. ii. p. 327.

Clement VII. elected pope in the year 1524.

XX. The good pope ADRIAN did not long enjoy the pleaſure of ſitting at the head of the church. He died in the year 1523, and was ſucceeded by CLEMENT VII., a man of a reſerved character, and prone to artifice [y]. This pontif ſent to the imperial diet at *Nuremberg*, in the year 1524, a cardinal-legate, named CAMPEGIUS, whoſe orders, with reſpect to the affairs of LUTHER, breathed nothing but ſeverity and violence, and who inveighed againſt the lenity of the German princes in delaying the execution of the decree of *Worms*, while he carefully avoided the ſmalleſt mention of the promiſe ADRIAN had made to reform the corruptions of a ſuperſtitious church. The emperor ſeconded the demands of CAMPEGIUS by the orders he ſent to his miniſter to inſiſt upon the execution of the ſentence which had been pronounced againſt LUTHER and his adherents at the diet of *Worms*. The princes of the empire, tired out by theſe importunities and remonſtrances, changed in appearance the law they had paſſed, but confirmed it in reality. For while they promiſed to obſerve, as far as was poſſible, the edict of *Worms*, they, at the ſame time, renewed their demands of a general council, and left all other matters in diſpute to be examined and decided at the diet that was ſoon to be aſſembled at *Spire*. The pope's legate, on the other hand, perceiving by theſe proceedings, that the German princes in general were no enemies to the Reformation, retired to *Ratiſbon*, with the biſhops and thoſe of the princes that adhered to the cauſe of *Rome*, and there drew from them a new declaration, by which they engaged themſelves to execute rigorouſly the edict of *Worms* in their reſpective dominions.

---

[y] See JAC. ZIEGLERI *Hiſtoria Clementis* VII. in JO. GEORGII SCHELHORNII *Amœnitates Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 210.

Carloſtadt and Zuinglc.

XXI. While the efforts of LUTHER towards the reformation of the church were daily crowned with growing ſucceſs, and almoſt all the nations ſeemed diſpoſed to open their eyes upon the light, two unhappy occurrences, one of a foreign, and the other of a domeſtic nature, contributed greatly to retard the progreſs of this ſalutary and glorious work. The domeſtic, or internal incident, was a controverſy concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of Chriſt were preſent in the eucharist, that aroſe among thoſe whom the Roman pontif had publicly excluded from the communion of the church, and unhappily produced among the friends of the good cauſe the moſt deplorable animoſities and diviſions. LUTHER and his followers, though they had rejected the monſtrous doctrine of the church of *Rome* with reſpect to the *tranſubſtantiation*, or change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of CHRIST, were nevertheleſs of opinion, that the partakers of the Lord's ſupper received, along with the bread and wine, the real body and blood of Chriſt. This, in their judgment, was a myſtery, which they did not pretend to explain [z]. CARLOSTADT, who was LUTHER'S colleague, underſtood the matter quite otherwiſe, and his doctrine, which was afterwards illuſtrated and

---

☞ [z] LUTHER was not ſo modeſt as Dr. MOSHEIM here repreſents him. He pretended to explain his doctrine of the *real preſence*, abſurd and contradictory as it was, and uttered much ſenſeleſs jargon on this ſubject. As in a red-hot iron, *ſaid he*, two diſtinct ſubſtances, *viz. iron* and *fire*, are united, ſo is the body of CHRIST joined with the bread in the eucharist. I mention this miſerable compariſon to ſhew into what abſurdities the towering pride of ſyſtem will often betray men of deep ſenſe and true genius.

confirmed by ZUINGLE with much more ingenuity than he had propoſed it, amounted to this: "That the body and blood of Chriſt were not " *really* preſent in the euchariſt; and that the " bread and wine were no more than external " *ſigns*, or *ſymbols*, deſigned to excite in the " minds of Chriſtians the remembrance of the " ſufferings and death of the divine Saviour, and " of the benefits which ariſe from it [a]." This opinion was embraced by all the friends of the Reformation in *Switzerland*, and by a conſiderable number of its votaries in *Germany*. On the other hand, LUTHER maintained his doctrine, in relation to this point, with the utmoſt obſtinacy; and hence aroſe, in the year 1524, a tedious and vehement controverſy, which, notwithſtanding the zealous endeavours that were uſed to reconcile the contending parties, terminated, at length, in a fatal diviſion between thoſe who had embarked together in the ſacred cauſe of religion and liberty.

The war of the Peaſants.

XXII. To theſe inteſtine diviſions were added the horrors of a civil war, which was the fatal effect of oppreſſion on the one hand, and of enthuſiaſm on the other; and, by its unhappy conſequences, was prejudicial to the cauſe and progreſs of the Reformation. In the year 1525, a prodigious multitude of ſeditious fanatics aroſe like a whirlwind, all of a ſudden, in different parts of *Germany*, took arms, united their forces, waged war againſt the laws, the magiſtrates, and the empire in general, laid waſte the country with fire and ſword, and exhibited daily the moſt horrid ſpectacles of unrelenting barbarity. The greateſt part of this furious and formidable mob was compoſed of peaſants and vaſſals, who groaned under heavy burthens, and declared they were no longer able to bear the deſpotic ſeverity of their chiefs; and hence this ſedition was called the *Ruſtic war*, or the war of the peaſants [*b*]. But it is alſo certain, that this motley crowd was intermixed with numbers, who joined in this ſedition from different motives, ſome impelled by the ſuggeſtions of enthuſiaſm, and others by the profligate and odious view of rapine and plunder, of mending fortunes ruined by extravagant and diſſolute living. At the firſt breaking out of this war, it ſeemed to have been kindled only by civil and political views; and agreeable to this is the general tenor of the *Declarations* and *Manifeſtoes* that were publiſhed by theſe rioters. The claims they made in theſe papers related to nothing farther than the diminution of the taſks impoſed upon the Peaſants, and to their obtaining a greater meaſure of liberty than they had hitherto enjoyed. Religion ſeemed to be out of the queſtion; at leaſt, it was not the object of deliberation or debate. But no ſooner had the enthuſiaſt MUNZER [*c*] put himſelf at the head of this outrageous rabble, than the face of things changed entirely, and by the inſtigation of this man, who had deceived numbers before this time by his pretended viſions and inſpirations, the civil commotions in *Saxony* and *Thuringia* were ſoon directed towards a new object, and were turned into a religious war. The ſentiments, however, of this ſeditious and diſſolute multitude were greatly divided, and their demands were very different. One part of them pleaded for an exemption from all laws, a licentious immunity from every ſort of government; another, leſs outrageous and extravagant, confined their demands to a diminution of the taxes they were forced to pay, and of the burthens under which they groaned [*d*]; another inſiſted upon a new form of religious doctrine, government, and worſhip, upon the eſtabliſhment of a pure and unſpotted church, and, to add weight to this demand, pretended, that it was ſuggeſted by the Holy Ghoſt, with which they were divinely and miraculouſly inſpired; while a very conſiderable part of this furious rabble were without any diſtinct view or any fixed purpoſe at all, but, infected with the contagious ſpirit of ſedition, and exaſperated by the ſeverity of their magiſtrates and rulers, went on headlong, without reflection or foreſight, into every act of violence and cruelty which rebellion and enthuſiaſm could ſuggeſt. So that, if it cannot be denied that many of theſe rioters had perverſely miſunderſtood the doctrine of LUTHER concerning Chriſtian liberty, and took occaſion from thence of committing the diſorders that rendered them ſo juſtly odious, yet, on the other hand, it would be a moſt abſurd inſtance of partiality and injuſtice to charge that doctrine with the blame of thoſe extravagant outrages that aroſe only from the manifeſt abuſe of it. LUTHER, himſelf, has indeed ſufficiently defended both his principles and his cauſe againſt any ſuch imputations by the books he wrote againſt this turbulent ſect, and the advice he addreſſed to the princes of the empire to take arms againſt them. And, accordingly, in the year 1525, this odious faction was defeated and deſtroyed, in a pitched battle fought at *Mulhauſen*; and MUNZER, their ringleader, taken, and put to death [*e*].

---

[a] See VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos*, par. I. lib. i. cap. ii. p. 55.—See alſo, on the other ſide of the queſtion, SCULTET's *Annales Evangelii*, publiſhed by VON DER HART, in his *Hiſtoria Liter. Reformat.* p. 74.—RUD. HOSPINIANUS, and other reformed writers, who have treated of the origin and progreſs of this diſpute. —— ☞ It appears from this repreſentation (which is a juſt one) of the ſentiments of ZUINGLE concerning the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's ſupper, that they were the ſame with thoſe maintained by Biſhop HOADLEY, in his *Plain Account of the Nature and Deſign of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

[*b*] Theſe kinds of wars, or commotions, ariſing from the impatience of the Peaſants, under the heavy burthens that were laid on them, were very common long before the time of LUTHER. Hence the author of the *Daniſh Chronicle* (publiſhed by the learned LUDEWIG, in the ninth volume of his *Reliq. MStorum*, p. 59.) calls theſe inſurrections a *common evil.* This will not appear ſurpriſing to ſuch as conſider, that in moſt places the condition of the peaſants was much more intolerable and grievous before the reformation, than it is in our times; and that the tyranny and cruelty of the nobility, before that happy period, were exceſſive and inſupportable.

[*c*] Or MUNSTER, as ſome call him.

[*d*] Theſe burthens were the duties of vaſſalage or feudal ſervices, which, in many reſpects, were truly grievous.

Frederick the Wiſe dies, and is ſucceeded by John, 1525—1527.

XXIII. While this fanatical inſurrection raged in *Germany*, FREDERICK *the Wiſe*, elector of *Saxony*, departed this life. This excellent prince, whoſe character was diſtinguiſhed by an uncommon degree of prudence and moderation, had, during his life, been a ſort of a mediator between the Roman pontif and the reformer of *Wittemberg*, and had always entertained the pleaſing hope of reſtoring peace in the church, and of ſo reconciling the contending parties as to prevent a ſeparation either in point of eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction or religious communion. Hence it was, that while, on the one hand, he made no oppoſition to LUTHER's deſign of reforming a corrupt and ſuperſtitious church, but rather encouraged him in the execution of this pious purpoſe; yet, on the other, it is remarkable, that he was at no pains to introduce any change into the churches that were eſtabliſhed in his own dominions, nor to ſubject them to his juriſdiction. The elector JOHN, his brother and ſucceſſor, acted in a quite different manner. Convinced of the truth of LUTHER's doctrine, and perſuaded that it muſt loſe ground and be ſoon ſuppreſſed if the deſpotic authority of the Roman pontif remained undiſputed and entire, he, without heſitation or delay, aſſumed to himſelf that ſupremacy in eccleſiaſtical matters that is the natural right of every lawful ſovereign, and founded and eſtabliſhed a church in his dominions, totally different from the church of *Rome*, in doctrine, diſcipline, and government. To bring this new and happy eſtabliſhment to as great a degree of perfection as was poſſible, this reſolute and active prince ordered a body of laws, relating to the form of eccleſiaſtical government, the method of public worſhip, the rank, offices, and revenues of the prieſthood, and other matters of that nature, to be drawn up by LUTHER and MELANCTHON, and promulgated by heralds throughout his dominions in the year 1527. He alſo took care that the churches ſhould every where be ſupplied with pious and learned doctors, and that ſuch of the clergy as diſhonoured religion by their bad morals, or were incapable of promoting its influence by their want of talents, ſhould be removed from the ſacred functions. The illuſtrious example of this elector was followed by all the princes and ſtates of *Germany*, who renounced the papal ſupremacy and juriſdiction, and a like form of worſhip, diſcipline, and government was thus introduced into all the churches, which diſſented from that of *Rome*. Thus may the elector JOHN be conſidered as the ſecond parent and founder of the Lutheran church, which he alone rendered a complete and independent body, diſtinct from the ſuperſtitious church of *Rome*, and fenced about with ſalutary laws, with a wiſe and well-balanced conſtitution of government. But as the beſt bleſſings may, through the influence of human corruption, become the innocent occaſions of great inconveniencies, ſuch particularly was the fate of thoſe wiſe and vigorous meaſures which this elector took for the reformation of the church; for, from that time, the religious differences between the German princes, which had been hitherto kept within the bounds of moderation, broke out into a violent and laſting flame. The prudence, or rather timorouſneſs, of FREDERICK *the Wiſe*, who avoided every reſolute meaſure that might be adapted to kindle the fire of diſcord, had preſerved a ſort of an external union and concord among theſe princes, notwithſtanding their difference in opinion. But as ſoon as his ſucceſſor, by the open and undiſguiſed ſteps he took, made it glaringly evident, that he deſigned to withdraw the churches in his dominions from the juriſdiction of *Rome*, and to reform the doctrine, diſcipline, and worſhip that had been hitherto eſtabliſhed, then indeed the ſcene changed. The union, which was more ſpecious than ſolid, and which was far from being well cemented, was diſſolved of a ſudden, the ſpirits heated and divided, and an open rupture formed between the German princes, of whom one party embraced the Reformation, and the other adhered to the ſuperſtitions of their forefathers.

[*e*] PETRI GNODALII *Hiſtoria de Seditione repentina Vulgi, præcipu Ruſticorum*, A. 1525, *tempore vero per univerſam fere Germaniam exorta*, Baſil. 1570, in 8vo.—See alſo D. TENZELII *Hiſtor. Reform.* tom. ii. p. 331.

The diet of *Spire* in 1526.

XXIV. Things being reduced to this violent and troubled ſtate, the patrons of popery gave intimations, that were far from being ambiguous, of their intention to make war upon the Lutheran party, and to ſuppreſs by *force* a doctrine which they were incapable of overturning by *argument*; and this deſign would certainly have been put in execution, had not the troubles of *Europe* diſconcerted their meaſures. The Lutherans, on the other hand, informed of theſe hoſtile intentions, began alſo to deliberate upon the moſt effectual methods of defending themſelves againſt ſuperſtition armed with violence, and formed the plan of a confederacy that might anſwer this prudent purpoſe. In the mean time the diet aſſembled at *Spire*, in the year 1526, at which FERDINAND, the emperor's brother, preſided, ended in a manner more favourable to the friends of the Reformation, than they could naturally expect. The emperor's ambaſſadors at this diet were ordered to uſe their moſt earneſt endeavours for the ſuppreſſion of all farther diſputes concerning religion, and to inſiſt upon the rigorous execution of the ſentence that had been pronounced at *Worms* againſt LUTHER and his followers. The greateſt part of the German princes oppoſed this motion with the utmoſt reſolution, declaring, that they could not execute that ſentence, nor come to any determination with reſpect to the doctrines by which it had been occaſioned, before the whole matter was ſubmitted to the cognizance of a general council lawfully aſſembled; alleging farther, that the deciſion of controverſies of this nature belonged properly to ſuch a council, and to it alone. This opinion, after long and warm debates, was adopted by a great majority, and, at length, conſented to by the whole aſſembly; for it was unanimouſly agreed to preſent a ſolemn addreſs to the emperor, beſeeching him to aſſemble, without delay, a free and a general council; and it was alſo agreed, that, in the mean time, the princes and ſtates of the empire ſhould, in their reſpective dominions, be at liberty to manage eccleſiaſtical matters in the manner they ſhould think the moſt expedient; yet ſo as to be able to give to God and to the emperor an account of their adminiſtration, when it ſhould be demanded of them.

The progreſs of the reformation after the diet at *Spire*, 1527.

XXV. Nothing could be more favourable to thoſe who had the cauſe of pure and genuine Chriſtianity at heart, than a reſolution of this nature. For the emperor was, at this time, ſo entirely taken up in regulating the troubled ſtate of his dominions in *France*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, which exhibited, from day to day, new ſcenes of perplexity, that, for ſome years, it was not in his power to turn his attention to the affairs of *Germany* in general, and ſtill leſs to the ſtate of religion in particular, which was beſet with difficulties, that, to a political prince like CHARLES, muſt have appeared peculiarly critical and dangerous. Beſides, had the emperor really been poſſeſſed of leiſure to form, or of power to execute, a plan that might terminate, in favour of the Roman pontif, the religious diſputes which reigned in *Germany*, it is evident, that the inclination was wanting, and that CLEMENT VII., who now ſat in the papal chair, had nothing to expect from the good offices of CHARLES V. For this pontif, after the defeat of FRANCIS I., at the battle of *Pavia*, filled with uneaſy apprehenſions of the growing power of the emperor in *Italy*, entered into a confederacy with the French and the Venetians againſt that prince. And this meaſure inflamed the reſentment and indignation of CHARLES to ſuch a degree, that he aboliſhed the papal authority in his Spaniſh dominions, made war upon the pope in *Italy*, laid ſiege to *Rome* in the year 1527, blocked up CLEMENT in the caſtle of *St. Angelo*, and expoſed him to the moſt ſevere and contumelius treatment. Theſe critical events, together with the liberty granted by the diet of *Spire*, were prudently and induſtriouſly improved, by the friends of the Reformation, to the advantage of their cauſe, and to the augmentation of their number. Several princes, whom the fear of perſecution and puniſhment had hitherto prevented from lending a hand to the good work, being delivered now from their reſtraint, renounced publicly the ſuperſtition of *Rome*, and introduced among their ſubjects the ſame forms of religious worſhip, and the ſame ſyſtem of doctrine, that had been received in *Saxony*. Others, though placed in ſuch circumſtances as diſcouraged them from acting in an open manner againſt the intereſts of the Roman pontif, were, however, far from diſcovering the ſmalleſt oppoſition to thoſe who withdrew the people from his deſpotic yoke; nor did they moleſt the private aſſemblies of thoſe who had ſeparated themſelves from the church of *Rome*. And in general, all the Germans, who, before theſe *reſolutions* of the diet of *Spire*, had rejected the papal diſcipline and doctrine, were now, in conſequence of the liberty they enjoyed by theſe reſolutions, wholly employed in bringing their ſchemes and plans to a certain degree of conſiſtence, and in adding vigour and firmneſs to the glorious cauſe in which they were engaged. In the mean time, LUTHER and his fellow-labourers, particularly thoſe who were with him at *Wittemberg*, by their writings, their inſtructions, their admonitions and counſels, inſpired the timorous with fortitude, diſpelled the doubts of the ignorant, fixed the principles and reſolution of the floating and inconſtant, and animated all the friends of genuine Chriſtianity with a ſpirit ſuitable to the grandeur of their undertaking.

Another diet held at *Spire*, in the year 1529. Origin of the denomination of proteſtants.

XXVI. But the tranquillity and liberty they enjoyed, in conſequence of the reſolutions taken in the firſt diet of *Spire*, were not of a long duration. They were interrupted by a new diet aſſembled, in the year 1529, in the ſame place, by the emperor, after he had appeaſed the commotions and troubles which had employed his attention in ſeveral parts of *Europe*, and concluded a treaty of peace with CLEMENT VII. This prince, having now got rid of the burthen that had, for ſome time, overwhelmed him, had leiſure to direct the affairs of the church; and this the reformers ſoon felt, by a diſagreeable experience. For the power, which had been granted by the former diet to every prince, of managing eccleſiaſtical matters as they thought proper, until the meeting of a general council, was now revoked by a majority of votes; and not only ſo, but every change was declared unlawful that ſhould be introduced into the doctrine, diſcipline, or worſhip of the eſtabliſhed religion, before the determination of the approaching council was known [*f*]. This decree was juſtly conſidered as iniquitous and intolerable by the elector of *Saxony*, the landgrave of *Heſſe*, and the other members of the diet, who were perſuaded of the neceſſity of a reformation in the church. Nor was any of them ſo ſimple, or ſo little acquainted with the politics of *Rome*, as to look upon the promiſes of aſſembling ſpeedily a general council, in any other light, than as an artifice to quiet the minds of the people; ſince it was eaſy to perceive, that a lawful council, free from the deſpotic influence of *Rome*, was the very laſt thing that a pope would grant in ſuch a critical ſituation of affairs. Therefore, when the princes and members now mentioned found that all their arguments and remonſtrances againſt this unjuſt decree made no impreſſion upon *Ferdinand* [*g*], nor upon the abettors of the ancient ſuperſtitions (whom the pope's legate animated by his preſence and exhortations), they entered a ſolemn *proteſt* againſt this decree on the 19th of April, and appealed to the emperor and to a future council [*h*]. Hence aroſe the denomination

---

☞ [*f*] The reſolution of the firſt diet of *Spire*, which had been taken *unanimouſly*, was revoked in the ſecond, and another ſubſtituted in its place by a *plurality of voices*, which, as ſeveral of the princes, then preſent, obſerved, could not give to any decree the force of a law throughout the empire.

☞ [*g*] The emperor was at *Barcelona*, while this diet was held at *Spire*; ſo that his brother FERDINAND was preſident in his place.

☞ [*h*] The princes of the empire, who entered this proteſt, and are conſequently to be conſidered as the firſt proteſtant princes, were JOHN elector of *Saxony*, GEORGE elector of *Brandenburg*, for *Franconia*, ERNEST and FRANCIS dukes of *Lunenburg*, the landgrave of *Heſſe*, and the prince of *Anhalt*.
These

nation of *Proteſtants*, which from this period has been given to thoſe who renounce the ſuperſtitious communion of the church of *Rome*.

Leagues formed between the proteſtants.

XXVII. The diſſenting princes, who were the protectors and heads of the reformed churches, had no ſooner entered their *proteſt*, than they ſent proper perſons to the emperor, who was then upon his paſſage from *Spain* to *Italy*, to acquaint him with their proceedings in this matter. The miniſters, employed in this commiſſion, executed the orders they had received with the greateſt reſolution and preſence of mind, and behaved with the ſpirit and firmneſs of the princes, whoſe ſentiments and conduct they were ſent to juſtify and explain. The emperor, whoſe pride was wounded by this fortitude in perſons that dared to oppoſe his deſigns, ordered theſe ambaſſadors to be apprehended and put under arreſt during ſeveral days. The news of this violent ſtep was ſoon brought to the proteſtant princes, and made them conclude that their perſonal ſafety, and the ſucceſs of their cauſe, depended entirely upon their courage and concord, the one animated, and the other cemented by a ſolemn confederacy. They, therefore, held ſeveral meetings at *Rot*, *Nuremberg*, *Smalcald*, and other places, in order to deliberate upon the means of forming ſuch a powerful league as might enable them to repel the violence of their enemies [*i*]. But ſo different were

---

Theſe princes were ſeconded by thirteen imperial towns, *viz.* *Straſburg*, *Ulm*, *Nuremberg*, *Conſtance*, *Rottingen*, *Windſeim*, *Memmingen*, *Nortlingen*, *Lindaw*, *Kempten*, *Heilbron*, *Wiſſemburg*, and *St. Gall.*

[*i*] See the hiſtory of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, wrote in German by the learned CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. tom. i. book II. ch. i. p. 128. and more eſpecially another German work of Dr. JOACHIM MULLER, entituled, *Hiſtorie von der Evangeliſchen Stande Proteſtation gegen den Speyerſchen Reichſabſcheid von* 1529, *Appellation*, &c. publiſhed at *Jena* in 4to, in the year 1703.

their opinions and views of things, that they could come to no ſatisfactory concluſion.

The conference at *Marpurg*, in the year 1529.

XXVIII. Among the incidents that promoted animoſity and diſcord between the friends of the Reformation, and prevented that union that was ſo much to be deſired between perſons embarked in the ſame good cauſe, the principal one was the diſpute that had ariſen between the divines of *Saxony* and *Switzerland*, concerning the manner of Chriſt's preſence in the *euchariſt*. To terminate this controverſy, PHILIP, landgrave of *Heſſe*, invited, in the year 1529, to a conference at *Marpurg*, LUTHER and ZUINGLE, together with ſome of the more eminent doctors, who adhered to the reſpective parties of theſe contending chiefs. This expedient, which was deſigned by that truly *magnanimous* prince, not ſo much to end the matter by keen debate, as to accommodate differences by the reconciling ſpirit of charity and prudence, was not attended with the ſalutary fruits that were expected from it. The divines that were aſſembled for this pacific purpoſe diſputed, during four days, in preſence of the landgrave. The principal champions in theſe debates were LUTHER, who attacked OECOLAMPADIUS, and MELANCTHON, who diſputed againſt ZUINGLE; and the controverſy turned upon ſeveral points of theology, in relation to which the Swiſs doctors were ſuppoſed to entertain erroneous ſentiments. For ZUINGLE was accuſed of hereſy, not only on account of his explication of the nature and deſign of the Lord's Supper, but alſo in conſequence of the falſe notions he was ſuppoſed to have adopted, relating to the divinity of Chriſt, the efficacy of the divine word, original ſin, and ſome other parts of the Chriſtian doctrine. This illuſtrious reformer cleared himſelf, however, from the greateſt part of theſe accuſations, with the moſt triumphant evidence, and in ſuch a manner as appeared entirely ſatisfactory, even to LUTHER himſelf. Their diſſenſion concerning the manner of CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt ſtill remained; nor could either of the contending parties be perſuaded to abandon, or even to modify, their opinion of that matter [*k*]. The only advantage, therefore, that reſulted from this conference, was, that the jarring doctors formed a ſort of truce, by agreeing to a mutual toleration of their reſpective ſentiments, and leaving to the diſpoſal of Providence, and the effects of time, which ſometimes cools the rage of party, the cure of their diviſions.

The diet of *Augſburg.*

XXIX. The miniſters of the churches, which had embraced the ſentiments of LUTHER, were preparing a new embaſſy to the emperor, when an account was received of a deſign formed by that prince to come into *Germany*, with a view to terminate, in the approaching diet at *Augſburg*, the religious diſputes that had produced ſuch animoſities and diviſions in the empire. CHARLES, though long abſent from *Germany*, and engaged in affairs that left him little leiſure for theological diſquiſitions, was nevertheleſs attentive to theſe diſputes, and foreſaw their conſequences. He had alſo, to his own deliberate reflexions upon theſe diſputes, added the councils of men of wiſdom, ſagacity, and experience, and was thus, at certain ſeaſons, rendered more cool in his proceedings, and more moderate and impartial in his opinion both of the contending parties and of the merits of the cauſe. He therefore, in an interview with the pope at *Bologna*, inſiſted, in the moſt ſerious and urgent manner, upon the neceſſity of aſſembling a general council. His remonſtrances and expoſtulations could not, however, move CLEMENT VII., who maintained with zeal the papal prerogatives, reproached the emperor with an ill-judged clemency, and alleged that it was the duty of that prince to ſupport the church, and to execute ſpeedy vengeance upon the obſtinate *heretical* faction, who dared to call in queſtion the authority of *Rome* and its pontif. The emperor was as little affected by this haughty diſcourſe, as the pope had been by his wiſe remonſtrances, and looked upon it as a moſt iniquitous thing, a meaſure alſo in direct oppoſition to the laws of the empire, to condemn, unheard, and to deſtroy, without any evidence of their demerit, a ſet of men, who had always approved themſelves good citizens, and had deſerved well of their country in ſeveral reſpects. Hitherto, indeed, it was not eaſy for the emperor to form a clear idea of the matters in debate, ſince there was no regular ſyſtem as yet compoſed, of the doctrines embraced by LUTHER and his followers, by which their real opinions, and the true cauſes of their oppoſition to the Roman pontif, might be known with certainty. As, therefore, it was impoſſible, without ſome declaration of this nature, to examine with accuracy, or decide with equity, a matter of ſuch high importance as that which gave riſe to the diviſions between the votaries of *Rome* and the friends of the Reformation, the elector of *Saxony* ordered LUTHER, and other eminent divines, to commit to writing the chief articles of their religious ſyſtem, and the principal points in which they differed from the church of *Rome*. LUTHER, in compliance with this order, delivered to the elector, at *Torgaw*, the ſeventeen articles, which had been drawn up and agreed on in the conference at *Sulzbach* in the year 1529;

[*k*] VAL. ERN. LOESCHERI *Hiſtoria motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformatos*, tom. i. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 143.—HENR. BULLINGERI *Hiſtoria Colloquii Marpurgenſis*, in JO. CONR. FUESSLIN's compilation, intituled, *Beytragen zur Schweizer Reformat. Geſchichte*, tom. iii. p. 156. See alſo the *Preface*, p. 80.—ABR. SCULTETI *Annal. Reformat. ad A.* 1529.—RUDOLPH. HOSPINIANI *Hiſtor. Sacramentar.* par. II. p. 72, &c.

and hence they were called the *articles of Torgaw* [*l*]. Though theſe articles were deemed by LUTHER a ſufficient declaration of the ſentiments of the reformers, yet it was judged proper to enlarge them; and, by a judicious detail, to give perſpicuity to their arguments, and thereby ſtrength to their cauſe. It was this conſideration that engaged the proteſtant princes, aſſembled at *Coburg* and *Augſburg*, to employ MELANCTHON in extending theſe *Articles*, in which important work he ſhewed a due regard to the counſels of LUTHER, and expreſſed his ſentiments and doctrine with the greateſt elegance and perſpicuity. And thus came forth to public view the famous *confeſſion of Augſburg*, which did ſuch honour to the acute judgment and the eloquent pen of MELANCTHON.

The progreſs of the reformation in *Sweden*, about the year 1530.

XXX. During theſe tranſactions in *Germany*, the dawn of truth aroſe upon other nations. The light of the reformation ſpread itſelf far and wide; and almoſt all the European ſtates welcomed its ſalutary beams, and exulted in the proſpect of an approaching deliverance from the yoke of ſuperſtition and ſpiritual deſpotiſm. Some of the moſt conſiderable provinces of *Europe* had already broke their chains, and openly withdrawn themſelves from the diſcipline of *Rome* and the juriſdiction of its pontif. And thus it appears that CLEMENT VII. was not impelled by a falſe alarm to demand of the emperor the ſpeedy extirpation of the reformers, ſince he had the juſteſt reaſons to apprehend the deſtruction of his ghoſtly empire. The reformed religion was propagated in *Sweden*, ſoon after LUTHER's rupture with *Rome*, by one of his diſciples, whoſe name was OLAUS PETRI, and who was the firſt herald of religious liberty in that kingdom. The zealous efforts of this miſſionary were powerfully ſeconded by that valiant and public-ſpirited prince, GUSTAVUS VASA ERICSON, whom the Swedes had raiſed to the throne in the place of CHRISTIERN, king of *Denmark*, whoſe horrid barbarity loſt him the ſceptre that he had perfidiouſly uſurped. This generous and patriotic hero had been in exile and in priſon, while the brutiſh uſurper, now mentioned, was involving his country in deſolation and miſery; but having eſcaped from his confinement and taken refuge at *Lubec*, he was there inſtructed in the principles of the Reformation, and looked upon the doctrine of LUTHER, not only as agreeable to the genius and ſpirit of the Goſpel, but alſo as favourable to the temporal ſtate and political conſtitution of the Swediſh dominions. The prudence, however, of this excellent prince was equal to his zeal, and accompanied it always. And, as the religious opinions of the Swedes were in a fluctuating ſtate, and their minds divided between their ancient ſuperſtitions, recommended by cuſtom, and the doctrine of LUTHER, which attracted their aſſent by the power of conviction and truth, GUSTAVUS wiſely avoided all vehemence and precipitation in ſpreading the new doctrine, and proceeded in this important undertaking with circumſpection, and by degrees, in a manner ſuitable to the principles of the Reformation, which are diametrically oppoſite to compulſion and violence [m]. Accordingly,

---

[*l*] See CHR. AUG. HEUMANNI *Diſſ. de lenitate Auguſtanæ Confeſſ. in Sylloge Diſſert. Theologicar.* tom. i. p. 14.—JO. JOACH. MULLER *Hiſtoria Proteſtationis*; and the other writers, who have treated either of the Reformation in general, or of the confeſſion of *Augſburg* in particular.

☞ [m] This incomparable model of princes gave many proofs of his wiſdom and moderation. Once, while he was abſent from *Stockholm*, a great number of German anabaptiſts, probably the riotous diſciples of *Munzer*, arrived in that city, carried their fanaticiſm to the higheſt extremities, pulled down with fury the images and other ornaments of the churches, while the *Lutherans* diſſembled their ſentiments of this riot in expectation that the ſtorm would turn to their advantage. But ingly, the firſt object of his attention was the inſtruction of his people in the ſacred doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, for which purpoſe he invited into his dominions ſeveral learned Germans, and ſpread abroad through the kingdom the Swediſh tranſlation of the Bible that had been made by OLAUS PETRI [n]. Some time after this, in the year 1526, he appointed a conference, at *Upſal*, between this eminent reformer and PETER GALLIUS, a zealous defender of the ancient ſuperſtition, in which theſe two champions were to plead publicly in behalf of their reſpective opinions, that it might thus be ſeen on which ſide the truth lay. The diſpute, in which OLAUS obtained a ſignal victory, contributed much to confirm GUSTAVUS in his perſuaſion of the truth of LUTHER's doctrine, and to promote the progreſs of that doctrine in *Sweden*. In the year following, another event gave the finiſhing ſtroke to its propagation and ſucceſs, and this was the aſſembly of the ſtates at *Weſteraas*, where GUSTAVUS recommended the doctrine of the reformers with ſuch zeal, wiſdom, and piety, that, after warm debates fomented by the clergy in general, and much oppoſition on the part of the biſhops in particular, it was unanimouſly reſolved, that the plan of reformation propoſed by LUTHER ſhould have

---

GUSTAVUS no ſooner returned to *Stockholm*, than he ordered the leaders of theſe fanatics to be ſeized and puniſhed, and covered the Lutherans with bitter reproaches for not having oppoſed theſe fanatics in time.

☞ [n] It is very remarkable, and ſhews the equity and candour of GUSTAVUS in the moſt ſtriking point of light, that while he ordered OLAUS to publiſh his literal tranſlation of the ſacred writings, he gave permiſſion at the ſame time to the archbiſhop of *Upſal*, to prepare another verſion ſuited to the doctrine of the church of *Rome*; that, by a careful compariſon of both tranſlations with the original, an eaſier acceſs might be opened to the truth. The biſhops at firſt oppoſed this order, but were at length obliged to ſubmit.

free admittance among the Swedes [*o*]. This reſolution was principally owing to the firmneſs and magnanimity of GUSTAVUS, who declared publicly, that he would lay down his ſceptre and retire from his kingdom, rather than rule a people enſlaved to the orders and authority of the pope, and more controlled by the tyranny of their biſhops, than by the laws of their monarch [*p*]. From this time the papal empire in *Sweden* was entirely overturned, and GUSTAVUS declared head of the church.

In *Denmark*.

XXXI. The light of the Reformation was alſo received in *Denmark*, and that ſo early as the year 1521, in conſequence of the ardent deſire diſcovered by CHRISTIAN or CHRISTIERN II., of having

---

☞ [*o*] It was no wonder indeed that the biſhops oppoſed warmly the propoſal of GUSTAVUS, ſince there was no country in *Europe*, where that order and the clergy in general drew greater temporal advantages from the ſuperſtition of the times than in *Sweden* and *Denmark*. The moſt of the biſhops had revenues ſuperior to thoſe of the ſovereign, they poſſeſſed caſtles and fortreſſes that rendered them independent on the crown, enabled them to excite commotions in the kingdom, and gave them a degree of power that was dangerous to the ſtate. They lived in the moſt diſſolute luxury and overgrown opulence, while the nobility of the kingdom were in miſery and want.—The reſolution formed by the ſtates, aſſembled at *Weſteraas*, did not ſo much tend to regulate points of doctrine as to reform the diſcipline of the church, to reduce the opulence and authority of the biſhops within their proper bounds, to reſtore to the impoveriſhed nobility the lands and poſſeſſions that their ſuperſtitious anceſtors had given to an all-devouring clergy, to exclude the prelates from the ſenate, to take from them their caſtles, and things of that nature. It was however reſolved at the ſame time, that the church ſhould be provided with able paſtors, who ſhould explain the pure word of God to the people in their native tongue; and that no eccleſiaſtical preferments ſhould be granted without the king's permiſſion. This was a tacit and gentle method of promoting the Reformation.

[*p*] BAZII *Inventarium Eccleſ. Sueco-Gothor.* publiſhed in 4to at *Lincoping*, in 1642.—SCULTETI *Annales Evangelii Renovati*, in VON DER HART *Hiſtor. Liter. Reformat.* part V. p. 84 et 110.—RAYNAL, *Anecdotes Hiſt. Politiques et Militaires*, tom. i. part II. p. 1, &c.

his ſubjects inſtructed in the principles and doctrines of LUTHER. This monarch, whoſe ſavage and infernal cruelty (whether it was the effect of natural temper, or of bad counſels) rendered his name odious and his memory execrable, was nevertheleſs deſirous of delivering his dominions from the ſuperſtition and tyranny of *Rome*. For this purpoſe, in the year 1520, he ſent for MARTIN REINARD, one of the diſciples of CARLOSTADT, out of *Saxony*, and appointed him profeſſor of divinity at *Hafnia*; and after his death, which happened the year following, he invited CARLOSTADT himſelf to fill that important place, which he accepted indeed, but nevertheleſs, after a ſhort reſidence in *Denmark*, returned into *Germany*. Theſe diſappointments did not abate the reforming ſpirit of the Daniſh monarch, who uſed his utmoſt endeavours, though in vain, to engage LUTHER to viſit his dominions, and took ſeveral ſteps that tended to the diminution, and, indeed, to the ſuppreſſion of the juriſdiction exerciſed over his ſubjects by the Roman pontif. It is, however, proper to obſerve, that in all theſe proceedings CHRISTIERN II. was animated by no other motive than that of ambition. It was the proſpect of extending his authority, and not a zeal for the advancement of true religion, that gave life and vigour to his reforming projects. His very actions, independently of what may be concluded from his known character, evidently ſhew that he protected the religion of LUTHER with no other view than to riſe by it to ſupremacy both in church and ſtate; and that it might afford him a pretext for depriving the biſhops of that overgrown authority and thoſe ample poſſeſſions which they had gradually uſurped [q], and of appropriating them to himſelf. A revolution produced by his avarice, tyranny, and cruelty, prevented the execution of this bold enterprize. The States of the kingdom exaſperated, ſome by the ſchemes he had laid for deſtroying the liberty of *Denmark*, others by his attempts to aboliſh the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors [r], and all by his ſavage and barbarous treatment of thoſe who dared to oppoſe his avarice or ambition, formed a conſpiracy againſt him in the year 1523, by which he was depoſed and baniſhed from his dominions, and his uncle, FREDERIC duke of *Holſtein* and *Sleſwic*, placed on the throne of *Denmark*.

---

[q] See Jo. GRAMMII *Diſſ. de Reformatione Daniæ à Chriſtierno tentata*, in the third volume of the *Scriptores Societ. Scientiar. Hafnienſ.* p. 1.—90.

The progreſs of the Reformation under the reigns of Frederic and Chriſtiern III.

XXXII. This prince conducted matters with much more equity, prudence, and moderation, than his predeceſſor had done. He permitted the proteſtant doctors to preach publicly the opinions of LUTHER [s], but did not venture ſo far as to change the eſtabliſhed government and diſcipline of the church. He contributed, however, greatly to the progreſs of the Reformation, by his ſucceſsful attempts in favour of religious liberty, at the aſſembly of the ſtates that was held at *Odenſee* in the year 1527. For it was here that he procured the publication of that famous edict, which declared every ſubject of *Denmark* free, either to adhere to the tenets of the church of *Rome*, or to embrace the doctrine of LUTHER [t]. Encouraged by this reſolution, the proteſtant divines exerciſed the functions of their miniſtry with ſuch zeal and ſucceſs, that the greateſt part of the Danes opened their eyes upon the auſpicious beams of ſacred liberty, and abandoned gradually both the doctrines and juriſdiction of the church of *Rome.* But the honour of finiſhing this glorious work, of deſtroying entirely the reign of ſuperſtition, and breaking aſunder the bonds of papal tyranny, was reſerved for CHRISTIERN III., a prince equally diſtinguiſhed by his piety and prudence. He began by ſuppreſſing the deſpotic authority of the biſhops, and by reſtoring to their lawful owners a great part of the wealth and poſſeſſions which the church had acquired by the artful ſtratagems of the crafty and deſigning clergy. This ſtep was followed by a wiſe and well-judged ſettlement of religious doctrine, diſcipline, and worſhip, throughout the kingdom, according to a plan laid down by BUGENHAGIUS, whom the king had ſent for from *Wittemberg* to perform that arduous taſk, for which his eminent piety, learning, and moderation rendered him peculiarly proper. The aſſembly of the ſtates at *Odenſee,* in the year 1539, gave a ſolemn ſanction to all theſe tranſactions; and thus the work of the Reformation was brought to perfection in *Denmark* [u].

---

[r] See for a confirmation of this part of the accuſation, a curious piece, containing the reaſons that induced the ſtates of *Denmark* to renounce their allegiance to CHRISTIERN II. This piece is to be found in the fifth volume of LUDEWIG's compilation, entitled *Reliquiæ MStorum*, p. 515. in which (p. 321.) the ſtates of *Denmark* expreſs their diſpleaſure at the royal favour ſhown to the Lutherans, in the following terms; *Lutheranæ hæreſis pullatores, contra jus, pietatemque, in regnum noſtrum catholicum introduxit, doctorem Caroloſtadium, fortiſſimum Lutheri athletam, enutrivit.*

[s] See JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. ii. p. 886.—CHRIST. OLIVARII *Vita Pauli Eliæ*, p. 108.—ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ*, tom. iii. p. 139.

XXXIII. It

☞ [t] It was farther added to this edict; that no perſon ſhould be moleſted on account of his religion, that a royal protection ſhould be granted to the Lutherans to defend them from the inſults and malignity of their enemies; and that eccleſiaſtics, of whatever rank or order, ſhould be permitted to enter into the married ſtate, and to fix their reſidence wherever they thought proper, without any regard to monaſteries or other religious ſocieties.

[u] ERICI PONTOPPIDANI, ſee a German work of the learned PONTOPPIDAN, entitled, *A Compendious view of the Hiſtory of the Reformation in Denmark,* publiſhed at *Lubec* in 8vo, in 1734; as alſo the *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ,* of the ſame

A diſtinction to be obſerved when we ſpeak of the reformation of *Sweden* and *Denmark*.

XXXIII. It is however to be obſerved, that, in the hiſtory of the reformation of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, we muſt carefully diſtinguiſh between the reformation of religious opinions and the reformation of the epiſcopal order. For though theſe two things may appear to be cloſely connected, yet, in reality, they are ſo far diſtinct, that either of the two might have been completely tranſacted without the other. A reformation of doctrine might have been effected without diminiſhing the authority of the biſhops, or ſuppreſſing their order; and, on the other hand, the opulence and power of the biſhops might have been reduced within proper bounds, without introducing any change into the ſyſtem of doctrine that had been ſo long eſtabliſhed, and that was generally received [*w*]. In the meaſures taken in theſe northern kingdoms, for the reformation of a corrupt doctrine and a ſuperſtitious diſcipline, there was nothing that deſerved the ſmalleſt cenſure: neither fraud nor violence were employed for this purpoſe; on the contrary, all things were conducted with wiſdom and moderation, in a manner ſuitable to the dictates of equity and the ſpirit of Chriſtianity. The ſame judgment cannot eaſily be pronounced with reſpect to the methods of proceeding in the reformation of the clergy, and more eſpecially of the epiſcopal order. For here,

---

ſame author, tom. ii. p. 799. tom. iii. p. 1.—HENR. MUHLIUS *de Reformat. religionis in vicinis Daniæ regionibus et potiſſimum in Cimbria*, in ejus *Diſſertationibus Hiſtorico-Theologicis*, p. 24. *Killiæ*, 1715, in 4to.

☞ [*w*] This obſervation is not worthy of Dr. MOSHEIM's ſagacity. The ſtrong connexion that there naturally is between ſuperſtitious ignorance among the people, and influence and power in their ſpiritual rulers, is too evident to ſtand in need of any proof. A good clergy will or ought to have an influence, in conſequence of a reſpectable office adorned with learning, piety, and morals; but the power of a licentious and deſpotic clergy can be only ſupported by the blind and ſuperſtitious credulity of their flock.

certainly, violence was uſed, and the biſhops were deprived of their honours, privileges, and poſſeſſions, without their conſent; and, indeed, notwithſtanding the greateſt ſtruggles and the warmeſt oppoſition [x]. The truth is, that ſo far as the reformation in *Sweden* and *Denmark* regarded the privileges and poſſeſſions of the biſhops, it was rather a matter of political expediency than of religious obligation; nay, a change here was become ſo neceſſary, that, had LUTHER and his doctrine never appeared in the world, it muſt have been nevertheleſs attempted by a wiſe legiſlator. For the biſhops, by a variety of perfidious ſtratagems, had got into their hands ſuch

---

☞ [x] What does Dr. MOSHEIM mean here? did ever a uſurper give us his unjuſt poſſeſſions without reluctance? does rapine conſtitute a right, when it is maintained by force? is it unlawful to uſe violence againſt extortioners? The queſtion here is, whether or no the biſhops deſerved the ſevere treatment they received from CHRISTIERN III.? and our author ſeems to anſwer this queſtion in the affirmative, and to declare this treatment both juſt and neceſſary in the following part of this ſection. Certain it is, that the biſhops were treated with great ſeverity, depoſed from their ſees, impriſoned on account of their reſiſtance; all the church-lands, towns, and fortreſſes, annexed to the crown, and the temporal power of the clergy for ever aboliſhed. It is alſo certain, that LUTHER himſelf looked upon theſe meaſures as violent and exceſſive, and even wrote a letter to CHRISTIERN, exhorting him to uſe the clergy with more lenity. It is therefore proper to decide with moderation on this ſubject, and to grant, that, if the inſolence and licentiouſneſs of the clergy were enormous, the reſentment of the Daniſh monarch may have been exceſſive. Nor indeed was his political prudence here ſo great as Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems to repreſent it; for the equipoiſe of government was hurt, by a total ſuppreſſion of the power of the biſhops. The nobility acquired by this a prodigious degree of influence, and the crown loſt an order, which, under proper regulations, might have been rendered one of the ſtrongeſt ſupports of its prerogative. But diſquiſitions of this nature are foreign to our purpoſe. It is only proper to obſerve, that, in the room of the biſhops, CHRISTIERN created an order of men, with the denomination of *ſuperintendants*, who performed the ſpiritual part of the epiſcopal office, without ſharing the leaſt ſhadow of temporal authority.

enormous treaſures, ſuch ample poſſeſſions, ſo many caſtles and fortified towns, and had aſſumed ſuch an unlimited and deſpotic authority, that they were in a condition to give law to the ſovereign himſelf, to rule the nation as they thought proper; and, in effect, already abuſed their power ſo far as to appropriate to themſelves a conſiderable part of the royal patrimony, and of the public revenues of the kingdom. Such therefore was the critical ſtate of theſe northern kingdoms, in the time of LUTHER, that it became abſolutely neceſſary, either to degrade the biſhops from that rank which they diſhonoured, and to deprive them of the greateſt part of thoſe poſſeſſions and prerogatives which they had ſo unjuſtly acquired and ſo licentiouſly abuſed, or to ſee, tamely, royalty rendered contemptible by its weakneſs, the ſovereign deprived of the means of protecting and ſuccouring his people, and the commonwealth expoſed to rebellion, miſery, and ruin.

The riſe and progreſs of the reformation in *France.*

XXXIV. The kingdom of *France* was not inacceſſible to the light of the Reformation. MARGARET queen of *Navarre,* ſiſter to FRANCIS I., the implacable enemy and perpetual rival of CHARLES V., was extremely favourable to the new doctrine, which delivered pure and genuine Chriſtianity from a great part of the ſuperſtitions under which it had ſo long lain diſguiſed. The auſpicious patronage of this illuſtrious princeſs encouraged ſeveral pious and learned men, whoſe religious ſentiments were the ſame with her's, to propagate the principles of the Reformation in *France,* and even to erect ſeveral proteſtant churches in that kingdom. It is manifeſt from the moſt authentic records, that, ſo early as the year 1523, there were, in ſeveral of the provinces of that country, multitudes of perſons, who had conceived the utmoſt averſion both againſt the

CENT. XVI. SECT. I.

doctrine and tyranny of *Rome*, and among theſe, many perſons of rank and dignity, and even ſome of the epiſcopal order. As their numbers increaſed from day to day, and troubles and commotions were excited in ſeveral places on account of religious differences, the authority of the monarch and the cruelty of his officers intervened, to ſupport the doctrine of *Rome* by the edge of the ſword and the terrors of the gibbet; and, on this occaſion many perſons, eminent for their piety and virtue, were put to death with the moſt unrelenting barbarity [*y*]. This cruelty, inſtead of retarding, accelerated rather the progreſs of the Reformation. It is nevertheleſs true, that, under the reign of Francis I., the reſtorers of genuine Chriſtianity were not always equally ſucceſsful and happy. Their ſituation was extremely uncertain, and it was perpetually changing. Sometimes they ſeemed to enjoy the auſpicious ſhade of royal protection; at others they groaned under the weight of perſecution, and at certain ſeaſons they were forgot, which oblivion rendered their condition tolerable. Francis, who had either no religion at all, or, at beſt, no fixed and conſiſtent ſyſtem of religious principles, conducted himſelf towards the proteſtants in ſuch a manner as anſwered his private and perſonal views, or as reaſons of policy and a public intereſt ſeemed to require. When it became neceſſary to engage in his cauſe the German proteſtants, in order to foment ſedition and rebellion againſt his mortal enemy Charles V., then did he treat the proteſtants in *France* with the utmoſt equity, humanity, and gentleneſs; but ſo ſoon as he had gained his point, and had no more occaſion for their ſervices, then he threw off the maſk, and appeared to them in the aſpect of an implacable and perſecuting tyrant [z].

[*y*] See Beze, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées de France*, tom. i. livr. i. p. 5.—Benoit, *Hiſtoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, livr. i. p. 6. —Christ. Aug. Salig. *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſion*, vol. ii. p. 190.

About this time the famous CALVIN, whoſe character, talents, and religious exploits, we ſhall have occaſion to dwell upon more amply in the courſe of this hiſtory, began to draw the attention of the public, but more eſpecially of the queen of *Navarre*. He was born at *Noyon* in *Picardy*, on the 10th of July 1509, and was bred up to the law [a], in which, as well as in all the other branches of literature, then known, his ſtudies were attended with the moſt rapid and amazing ſucceſs. Having acquired the knowledge of religion, by a diligent peruſal of the holy ſcriptures, he began early to perceive the neceſſity of reforming the eſtabliſhed ſyſtem of doctrine and worſhip. His zeal expoſed him to various perils, and the connexions he had formed with the friends of the Reformation, whom FRANCIS I. was daily committing to the flames, placed him more than once in imminent danger, from which he was delivered by the good offices of the excellent queen of

---

☞ [z] The inconſiſtency and contradiction that were viſible in the conduct of FRANCIS I. may be attributed to various reaſons. At one time, we ſee him reſolved to invite MELANCTHON into *France*, probably with a view to pleaſe his ſiſter the queen of *Navarre*, whom he loved tenderly, and who had ſtrongly imbibed the principles of the proteſtants. At another time, we behold him exerciſing the moſt infernal cruelty towards the friends of the Reformation, and hear him making that mad declaration, *that, if he thought the blood in his arm was tainted with the Lutheran hereſy, he would have it cut off; and that he would not ſpare even his own children, if they entertained ſentiments contrary to thoſe of the catholic church*. See FLOR. DE REMOND, *Hiſt. de la Naiſſance et du Progrès de l'Hereſie*, livr. vii.

☞ [a] He was originally deſigned for the church, and had actually obtained a benefice: but the light that broke in upon his religious ſentiments, as well as the preference given by his father to the profeſſion of the law, induced him to give up his eccleſiaſtic vocation, which he afterwards reſumed in a purer church.

of *Navarre*. To eſcape the impending ſtorm, he retired to *Baſil*, where he publiſhed his *Chriſtian inſtitutions*; and prefixed to them that famous dedication to FRANCIS I. which has attracted univerſally the admiration of ſucceeding ages, and which was deſigned to ſoften the unrelenting fury of that prince, againſt the proteſtants [*b*].

And in the other ſtates of *Europe*.

XXXV. The inſtances of an oppoſition to the doctrine and diſcipline of *Rome* in the other European ſtates, were few in number, before the diet of *Augſburg*, and were too faint, imperfect, and ambiguous to make much noiſe in the world. It, however, appears from the moſt authentic teſtimonies, that, even before that period, the doctrine of LUTHER had made a conſiderable, though perhaps a ſecret, progreſs in *Spain*, *Hungary*, *Bohemia*, *Britain*, *Poland*, and the *Netherlands*, and had, in all theſe countries, many friends, of whom ſeveral repaired to *Wittemberg*, to improve their knowledge and enlarge their views under ſuch an eminent maſter. Some of theſe countries openly broke aſunder the chains of ſuperſtition, and withdrew themſelves, in a public and conſtitutional manner, from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif. In others, a prodigious number of families received the light of the bleſſed Reformation, rejected the doctrines and authority of *Rome*; and, notwithſtanding the calamities and perſecutions they have ſuffered, on account of their ſentiments, under the ſceptre of bigotry and

---

☞ [*b*] This paragraph, relating to CALVIN, is added to Dr. MOSHEIM's text by the tranſlator, who was ſurprized to find, in a Hiſtory of the Reformation, ſuch late mention made of one of its moſt diſtinguiſhed and remarkable inſtruments; a man whoſe extenſive genius, flowing eloquence, immenſe learning, extraordinary penetration, indefatigable induſtry, and fervent piety, placed him at the head of the reformers; all of whom he ſurpaſſed, at leaſt, in learning and parts, as he alſo did the moſt of them, in obſtinacy, aſperity, and turbulence.

ſuperſtition, continue ſtill in the profeſſion of the pure doctrine of Chriſtianity; while in other, ſtill more unhappy, lands, the moſt barbarous tortures, the moſt infernal ſpirit of cruelty, together with penal laws adapted to ſtrike terror into the firmeſt minds, have extinguiſhed, almoſt totally, the light of religious truth. It is, indeed, certain, and the Roman catholics themſelves acknowledge it without heſitation, that the papal doctrines, juriſdiction, and authority, would have fallen into ruin in all parts of the world, had not the force of the ſecular arm been employed to ſupport this tottering edifice, and fire and ſword been let looſe upon thoſe who were aſſailing it only with reaſon and argument.

CHAP. III.

The Hiſtory of the Reformation, from the time that the confeſſion of Augſburg *was preſented to the emperor, until the commencement of the war which ſucceeded the league of* Smalcald.

The confeſſion of *Augſburg* preſented to Charles V.

I. CHARLES V. arrived at *Augſburg* the 15th of *June* 1530, and on the 20th day of the ſame month, the diet was opened. As it was unanimouſly agreed, that the affairs of religion ſhould be brought upon the carpet before the deliberations relating to the intended war with the Turks, the *proteſtant* members of this great aſſembly received from the emperor a formal permiſſion to preſent to the diet, on the 25th of June, an account of their religious principles and tenets. In conſequence of this, CHRISTIAN BAYER, chancellor of *Saxony*, read, in the German language, in preſence of the emperor and the aſſembled princes, the famous confeſſion, which has been ſince diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of the *confeſſion of Augſburg*. The princes heard it with the deepeſt attention and recollection of mind; it confirmed ſome in the principles they had embraced, ſurpriſed others, and many, who, before this time, had little or no idea of the religious ſentiments of LUTHER, were now not only convinced of their innocence, but were, moreover, delighted with their purity and ſimplicity. The copies of this *confeſſion*, which, after being read, were delivered to the emperor, were ſigned and ſubſcribed by JOHN, elector of *Saxony*, by four princes of the empire, GEORGE, marquis of *Brandenburg*, ERNEST, duke of *Lunenburg*, PHILIP, landgrave of *Heſſe*, WOLFGANG, prince of *Anhalt*, and by the imperial cities of *Nuremburg* and *Reutlingen*, who all thereby ſolemnly declared their aſſent to the doctrines contained in it [c].

The nature and contents of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*.

II. The tenor and contents of the confeſſion of *Augſburg* are well known; at leaſt, by all who have the ſmalleſt acquaintance with eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; ſince that confeſſion was adopted by the whole body of the *proteſtants* as the rule of their faith. The ſtyle that reigns in it is plain, elegant, grave, and perſpicuous, ſuch as becomes the nature of the ſubject, and ſuch as might be expected from the admirable pen of MELANCTHON. The *matter* was, undoubtedly, ſupplied by LUTHER, who, during the diet, reſided at *Coburg*, a town in the neighbourhood of *Augſburg*; and, even the *form* it received from the eloquent pen of his colleague, was authoriſed in conſequence of his approbation and advice. This *confeſſion* contains twenty-eight chapters, of which the greateſt part [*d*] are employed in repreſenting, with perſpicuity and truth, the religious opinions of the proteſtants, and the reſt in pointing out the errors and abuſes that occaſioned their ſeparation from the church of *Rome* [*e*].

---

[c] There is a very voluminous hiſtory of this diet, which was publiſhed in the year 1577, in *folio*, at *Francfort on Oder*, by the laborious GEORGE CELESTINE. The hiſtory of the *Confeſſion* of *Augſburg* was compoſed, in Latin, by DAVID CHYTRÆUS, and more recently, in German, by ERN. SOLOM. CYPRIAN and CHRISTOPHER AUG. SALIG. The performance of the latter is rather, indeed, a hiſtory of the *Reformation* in general, than of the *Confeſſion of Augſburg* in particular. That of CYPRIAN is more conciſe and elegant, and is confirmed by original pieces, which are equally authentic and curious.

The Roman catholics attempt a refutation of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*.

III. The creatures of the Roman pontif, who were preſent at this diet, employed JOHN FABER, afterwards biſhop of *Vienna*, together with ECKIUS and another doctor, named COCHLÆUS, to draw up a refutation of this famous confeſſion. This pretended refutation having been read publicly in the aſſembly, the emperor demanded of the proteſtant members that they would acquieſce in it, and put an end to their religious debates by an unlimited ſubmiſſion to the doctrines and opinions contained in this anſwer. But this demand was far from being complied with. The proteſtants declared, on the contrary, that they were by no means ſatisfied with the reply of their adverſaries, and earneſtly deſired a copy of it, that they might demonſtrate more fully its extreme inſufficiency and weakneſs. This reaſonable requeſt was refuſed by the emperor, who, on this occaſion, as well as on ſeveral others, ſhewed more regard to the importunity of the pope's legate and his party, than to the demands of equity, candour, and juſtice. He even interpoſed his ſupreme authority to ſuſpend any further proceeding in this matter, and ſolemnly prohibited the publication of any new writings or declarations that might contribute to lengthen out theſe religious debates. This, however, did not reduce the *proteſtants* to ſilence. The divines of that communion, who had been preſent at the diet, endeavoured to recollect the arguments and objections employed by FABER, and had again recourſe to the pen of MELANCTHON, who refuted them, in an ample and ſatisfactory manner, in a learned piece that was preſented to the emperor on the 22d of September, but which that prince refuſed to receive. This *anſwer* was afterwards enlarged by MELANCTHON, when he had obtained a copy of FABER's reply, and was publiſhed in the year 1531, with the other pieces that related to the doctrine and diſcipline of the Lutheran church, under the title of *A defence of the confeſſion of Augſburg*.

[*d*] Twenty-one chapters were ſo employed; the other ſeven contained a detail of the errors and ſuperſtitions of the church of *Rome*.

☞ [*e*] It is proper to obſerve here, that, while the Lutherans preſented their *Confeſſion* to the diet, another excellent *Remonſtrance* of the ſame nature was addreſſed to this auguſt aſſembly by the cities of *Straſburg*, *Conſtance*, *Memingen*, and *Lindaw*, which had rejected the errors and juriſdiction of *Rome*, but did not enter into the Lutheran league, becauſe they adopted the opinions of ZUINGLE in relation to the euchariſt. The declaration of theſe four towns (which was called the *Tetrapolitan Confeſſion*, on account of their number) was drawn up by the excellent MARTIN BUCER, and was conſidered as a maſterpiece of reaſoning and eloquence, not only by the proteſtants, but even by ſeveral of the Roman-catholics; and among others by Mr. DUPIN. ZUINGLE alſo ſent to this diet a private confeſſion of his religious opinions. It is however remarkable, that though BUCER compoſed a ſeparate *Remonſtrance*, yet his name appears among the ſubſcribers at *Smalcald*, in the year 1537, to the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, and to MELANCTHON's defence of it.

Deliberations concerning the method to be uſed in terminating theſe religious diſſenſions.

IV. There were only three ways left of bringing to a concluſion theſe religious differences, which, it was, in reality, moſt difficult to reconcile. The firſt and the moſt rational method was, to grant to thoſe who refuſed to ſubmit to the doctrine and juriſdiction of *Rome*, the liberty of following their private judgment in matters of a religious nature, the privilege of ſerving God according to the dictates of their conſcience; and all this in ſuch a manner that the public tranquillity ſhould not be diſturbed. The ſecond, and, at the ſame time, the ſhorteſt and moſt iniquitous expedient, was to end theſe diſſenſions by military apoſtles, who, ſword in hand, ſhould force the proteſtants to return to the boſom of the church, and to court the papal yoke, which they had ſo magnanimouſly thrown off their necks. Some thought of a middle way, which lay equally remote from the difficulties that attended the two methods now mentioned, and propoſed that a reconciliation ſhould be made upon fair, candid, and equitable terms, by engaging each of the contending parties to temper their zeal with moderation, to abate reciprocally the rigour of their pretenſions, and remit ſome of their reſpective claims. This method, which ſeemed agreeable to the dictates of reaſon, charity, and juſtice, was highly approved of by ſeveral wiſe and good men, on both ſides; but it was ill-ſuited to the arrogant ambition of the Roman pontif, and the ſuperſtitious ignorance of the times, which beheld with horror, whatever tended to introduce the ſweets of religious liberty, or the exerciſe of private judgment. The ſecond method, even the uſe of violence, and the terrors of the ſword, was more agreeable to the ſpirit and ſentiments of the age, and was peculiarly ſuited to the deſpotic genius and ſanguine counſels of the court of *Rome*; but the emperor had prudence and equity enough to make him reject it, and it appeared ſhocking to thoſe who were not loſt to all ſentiments of juſtice or moderation. The third expedient was therefore moſt generally approved of; it was peculiarly agreeable to all who were zealous for the intereſts and tranquillity of the empire, nor did the Roman pontif ſeem to look upon it either with averſion or contempt. Hence various conferences were held between perſons of eminence, piety, and learning, who were choſen for that purpoſe from both ſides, and nothing was omitted that might have the leaſt tendency to calm the animoſity, heal the diviſions, and unite the hearts of the contending parties [*f*]; but all to no purpoſe, ſince the difference between their opinions was too conſiderable, and of too much importance, to admit of a reconciliation. It was in theſe conferences that the ſpirit and character of MELANCTHON appeared in their true and genuine colours; and it was here that the votaries of *Rome* exhauſted their efforts to gain over to their party this pillar of the Reformation, whoſe abilities and virtues added ſuch a luſtre to the proteſtant cauſe. This humane and gentle ſpirit was apt to ſink into a kind of yielding ſoftneſs under the influence of mild and generous treatment. And, accordingly, while his adverſaries ſoothed him with fair words and flattering promiſes, he ſeemed to melt as they ſpoke, and, in ſome meaſure, to comply with their demands: but, when they ſo far forgot themſelves as to make uſe of imperious language and menacing terms, then did MELANCTHON appear in a very different

---

☞ [*f*] As in the confeſſion of *Augſburg* there were three ſorts of articles, one ſort orthodox, and adopted by both ſides; another that conſiſted of certain propoſitions, which the papal party conſidered as ambiguous and obſcure; and a third, in which the doctrine of LUTHER was entirely oppoſite to that of *Rome*; this gave ſome reaſon to hope that, by the means of certain conceſſions and modifications, conducted mutually by a ſpirit of candour and charity, matters might be accommodated at laſt. For this purpoſe, ſelect perſons were appointed to carry on this ſalutary work, at firſt ſeven from each party, conſiſting of princes, lawyers, and divines, which number was afterwards reduced to three. LUTHER's obſtinate, ſtubborn, and violent temper, rendering him unfit for healing diviſions, he was not employed in theſe conferences, but he was conſtantly conſulted by the proteſtant party; and it was with a view to this that he reſided at *Coburg*.

point of light; then a ſpirit of intrepidity, ardor, and independence animated all his words and actions, and he looked down with contempt on the threats of power, the frowns of fortune, and the fear of death. The truth is, that, in this great and good man, a ſoft and yielding temper was joined with the moſt inviolable fidelity, and the moſt invincible attachment to the truth.

The reſult of theſe conferences.

V. This reconciling method of terminating the religious debates, between the friends of liberty and the votaries of *Rome*, proving ineffectual, the latter had recourſe to other meaſures, which were ſuited to the iniquity of the times, though they were equally diſavowed by the dictates of reaſon and the precepts of the goſpel. Theſe meaſures were, the force of the ſecular arm, and the authority of imperial edicts. On the 19th day of November, a ſevere decree was iſſued out, by the expreſs order of the emperor, during the abſence of the Heſſian and Saxon princes, who were the chief ſupporters of the proteſtant cauſe; and, in this decree, every thing was manifeſtly adapted to deject the friends of religious liberty, if we except a faint and dubious promiſe of engaging the pope to aſſemble (in about ſix months after the ſeparation of the diet) a general council. The dignity and excellence of the papal religion are extolled, beyond meaſure, in this partial decree; a new decree of ſeverity and force added to that which had been publiſhed at *Worms* againſt LUTHER and his adherents; the changes that had been introduced into the doctrine and diſcipline of the proteſtant churches, ſeverely cenſured; and a ſolemn order addreſſed to the princes, ſtates, and cities, that had thrown off the papal yoke, to return to their duty and their allegiance to *Rome*, on pain of incurring the indignation and vengeance of the emperor,

peror, as the patron and protector of the church [g].

The league of *Smalcald.*

VI. No ſooner were the elector of *Saxony* and the confederate princes informed of this deplorable iſſue of the diet of *Augſburg*, than they aſſembled in order to deliberate upon the meaſures that were proper to be taken on this critical occaſion. In the year 1530, and the year following, they met, firſt at *Smalcald*, afterwards at *Francfort*, and formed a ſolemn alliance and confederacy, with the intention of defending vigorouſly their religion and liberties againſt the dangers and encroachments with which they were menaced by the edict of *Augſburg*, without attempting, however, any thing, properly ſpeaking, offenſive againſt the votaries of *Rome*. Into this confederacy they invited the kings of *England*, *France*, and *Denmark*, with ſeveral other republics and ſtates, and left no means unemployed that might tend to corroborate and cement this important alliance [h]. Amidſt theſe emotions and preparations,

---

☞ [g] To give the greater degree of weight to this edict it was reſolved, that no judge, who refuſed to approve and ſubſcribe its contents, ſhould be admitted into the imperial chamber of *Spire*, which is the ſupreme court in *Germany*. The emperor alſo and the popiſh princes engaged themſelves to employ their united forces in order to maintain its authority, and to promote its execution.

☞ [h] LUTHER, who at firſt ſeemed averſe to this confederacy, from an apprehenſion of the calamities and troubles it might produce; perceiving at length its neceſſity, conſented to it; but, uncharitably, as well as imprudently, refuſed comprehending in it the followers of ZUINGLE among the Swiſs, together with the German ſtates or cities, which had adopted the ſentiments and confeſſion of BUCER. And yet we find that the cities of *Ulm* and *Augſburg* had embraced the Reformation on the principles of ZUINGLE.—In the invitation addreſſed to HENRY VIII. king of *England*, whom the confederate princes were willing to declare the head and protector of their league, the following things were expreſsly ſtipulated among ſeveral others: *viz.* That the king ſhould encourage, promote, and maintain the true doctrine of CHRIST, as it was contained rations, which portended an approaching rupture, the elector Palatine, and the elector of *Mentz*, offered their mediation, and endeavoured to reconcile the contending princes. With reſpect to the emperor, various reaſons united to turn his views towards peace. For, on the one hand, he ſtood in need of ſuccours againſt the Turk, which the proteſtant princes refuſed to grant as long as the edicts of *Worms* and *Augſburg* remained in force; and, on the other, the election of his brother FERDINAND to the dignity of king of the Romans, which had been concluded by a majority of votes,

contained in the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, and defend the ſame at the next general council;—that he ſhould not agree to any council ſummoned by the biſhop of *Rome*, but proteſt againſt it, and neither ſubmit to its decrees, nor ſuffer them to be reſpected in his dominions;—that he ſhould never allow the Roman pontif to have any pre-eminence or juriſdiction in his dominions;—that he ſhould advance 100,000 crowns for the uſe of the confederacy, and double that ſum if it became neceſſary; all which articles the confederate princes were obliged equally to obſerve on their part. To theſe demands the king anſwered, immediately, in a manner that was not ſatisfactory. He declared, that he would maintain and promote the true doctrine of CHRIST; but, at the ſame time, as the true ground of that doctrine lay only in the Holy Scriptures, he would not accept, at any one's hand, what ſhould be his faith, or that of his kingdoms, and therefore deſired they would ſend over learned men to confer with him, in order to promote a religious union between him and the confederates. He moreover declared himſelf of their opinion with reſpect to the meeting of a free general council, promiſed to join with them, in all ſuch councils, for the defence of the true doctrine; but thought the regulation of the ceremonial part of religion, being a matter of indifference, ought to be left to the choice of each ſovereign for his own dominions. After this, the king gave them a ſecond anſwer more full and ſatisfactory; but upon the fall of queen ANNE, this negociation came to nothing. On the one hand, the king grew cold, when he perceived that the confederates could be of no longer ſervice to him in ſupporting the validity of his marriage; and, on the other, the German princes were ſenſible that they could never ſucceed with HENRY, unleſs they would allow him an abſolute dictatorſhip in matters of religion.

at the diet of *Cologn*, in the year 1531, was conteſted by the ſame princes as contrary to the fundamental laws of the empire.

The peace of *Nuremberg.*

VII. In this troubled ſtate of affairs many projects of reconciliation were propoſed; and, after various negociations, a treaty of peace was concluded at *Nuremberg*, in the year 1532, between the emperor and the proteſtant princes, on the following conditions; that the latter ſhould furniſh a ſubſidy for carrying on the war againſt the Turk, and acknowledge FERDINAND lawful king of the Romans; and that the emperor, on his part, ſhould abrogate and annul the edicts of *Worms* and *Augſburg*, and allow the Lutherans the free and unmoleſted exerciſe of their religious doctrine and diſcipline, until a rule of faith was fixed either in the free general council that was to be aſſembled in the ſpace of ſix months, or in a diet of the empire. The apprehenſion of an approaching rupture was ſcarcely removed by this agreement, when JOHN, elector of *Saxony*, died, and was ſucceeded by his ſon JOHN FREDERICK, a prince of invincible fortitude and magnanimity, whoſe reign was little better than a continued ſcene of diſappointments and calamities.

A council expected in vain.

VIII. The religious truce, concluded at *Nuremberg*, inſpired with new vigour and reſolution all the friends of the reformation. It gave ſtrength to the feeble, and perſeverance to the bold. Encouraged by it, thoſe who had been hitherto only ſecret enemies to the Roman pontif, ſpurned now his yoke publicly, and refuſed to ſubmit to his imperious juriſdiction. This appears from the various cities and provinces in *Germany*, which, about this time, boldly enliſted themſelves under the religious ſtandards of LUTHER. On the other hand, as all hope of terminating the religious debates that divided *Europe* was founded in the meeting of the general council, which had been ſo ſolemnly promiſed, the emperor renewed his earneſt requeſts to CLEMENT VII., that he would haſten an event that was expected and deſired with ſo much impatience. The pontif, whom the hiſtory of paſt councils filled with the moſt uneaſy and diſcouraging apprehenſions, endeavoured to retard what he could not, with any decency, abſolutely refuſe [i]. He formed innumerable pretexts to put off the evil day; and his whole conduct evidently ſhewed, that he was more deſirous of having theſe religious differences decided by the force of arms, than by the power of argument. He indeed, in the year 1533, made a propoſal, by his legate, to aſſemble a council at *Mantua*, *Placentia*, or *Bologna*; but the proteſtants refuſed their conſent to the nomination of an Italian council, and inſiſted, that a controverſy, which had its riſe in the heart of *Germany*, ſhould be decided within the limits of the empire.. The pope, by his uſual artifices, eluded his own promiſe, diſappointed their expectations, and was cut off by death, in the year 1534, in the midſt of his ſtratagems [k].

IX. His ſucceſſor PAUL III. ſeemed to ſhew leſs reluctance to the aſſembling a general council, and appeared even diſpoſed to comply with the deſires of the emperor in that reſpect. Accordingly, in the year 1535, he expreſſed his inclination to convoke one at *Mantua*; and, the

---

☞ [i] Beſides the fear of ſeeing his authority diminiſhed by a general council, another reaſon engaged CLEMENT VII. to avoid an aſſembly of that nature; for being conſcious of the illegitimacy of his birth, as FRAO PAULO obſerves, he had ground to fear that the COLONNAS, or his other enemies, might plead this circumſtance before the council, as a reaſon for his excluſion from the pontificate; ſince it might be well queſtioned, whether a *baſtard* could be a pope, though it is known, from many inſtances, that a *profligate* may.

[k] See an ample account of every thing relative to this council, in FRA. PAULO's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, book I.

110768

year following, actually ſent circular letters for that purpoſe through all the kingdoms and ſtates under his juriſdiction [l]. The proteſtants, on the other hand, fully perſuaded, that, in ſuch a council [m], all things would be carried by the votaries of *Rome*, and nothing concluded but what ſhould be agreeable to the ſentiments and ambition, of the pontif, aſſembled at *Smalcald* in the year 1537. And there they proteſted ſolemnly againſt ſuch a partial and corrupt council as that which was convoked by PAUL III.; but, at the ſame time, had a new *ſummary* of their doctrine drawn up by LUTHER, in order to preſent it to the aſſembled biſhops, if it was required of them. This ſummary, which was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *Articles of Smalcald*, is generally joined with the creeds and confeſſions of the Lutheran church.

New outrages committed by the anabaptiſts.

X. During theſe tranſactions, two remarkable events happened, of which the one was moſt detrimental to the cauſe of religion in general, to that of the Reformation in particular, and produced, in *Germany*, civil tumults and commotions of the moſt horrid kind; while the other was more ſalutary in its conſequences and effects, and ſtruck at the very root of the papal authority and dominion. The former of theſe events was

---

☞ [l] This council was ſummoned, by PAUL III., to aſſemble at *Mantua*, on the 23d of May, 1537, by a bull iſſued out the 2d of June of the preceding year. Several obſtacles prevented its meeting. Frederick, duke of *Mantua*, was not much inclined to receive at once ſo many gueſts, and ſome of them turbulent ones, into the place of his reſidence.

☞ [m] That is, in a council aſſembled by the authority of the pope alone, and that alſo in *Italy*; two circumſtances that muſt have greatly contributed to give PAUL III. an undue influence in that aſſembly. The proteſtants maintained, that the emperor and the other Chriſtian princes of *Europe* had a right to be *authoritatively* concerned in calling a general council; and that ſo much the more, as the Roman pontif was evidently one of the parties in the preſent debate.

a new ſedition, kindled by a fanatical and outrageous mob of the *anabaptiſts*; and the latter, the rupture between Henry VIII. king of *England*, and the Roman pontif, whoſe juriſdiction and ſpiritual ſupremacy were publicly renounced by that rough and reſolute monarch.

In the year 1533, there came to *Munſter*, a city in *Weſtphalia*, a certain number of *anabaptiſts*, who ſurpaſſed the reſt of that fanatical tribe in the extravagance of their proceedings, the frenzy of their diſordered brains, and the madneſs of their pretenſions and projects. They gave themſelves out for the meſſengers of heaven, inveſted with a divine commiſſion to lay the foundations of a new government, a holy and ſpiritual empire, and to deſtroy and overturn all temporal rule and authority, all human and political inſtitutions. Having turned all things into confuſion and uproar in the city of *Munſter* by this ſeditious and extravagant declaration, they began to erect a new republic [*n*], conformable to their abſurd and chimerical notions of religion, and committed the adminiſtration of it to John Bockholt, a taylor by profeſſion, and a native of *Leyden*. Their reign, however, was of a ſhort duration; for, in the year 1535, the city was beſieged and taken by the biſhop of *Munſter*, aſſiſted by other German princes; this fanatical king and his wrong-headed aſſociates put to death in the moſt terrible and ignominious manner, and the new hierarchy deſtroyed with its furious and extravagant founders. This diſorderly and outrageous conduct of an handful of anabaptiſts, drew upon the whole body heavy marks of diſpleaſure from the greateſt part of the European princes. The ſevereſt laws were enacted againſt them for the ſecond time, in conſequence of which the innocent and the guilty were involved in the ſame terrible fate, and prodigious numbers devoted to death in the moſt dreadful forms [o].

[*n*] This fanatical eſtabliſhment they diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *New Jeruſalem*.

Great Britain renounces the ſpiritual juriſdiction and ſupremacy of the Roman pontif.

XI. The pillars of papal deſpotiſm were at this time ſhaken in *England* by an event, which, at firſt, did not ſeem to promiſe ſuch important conſequences. HENRY VIII., a prince who in vices and in abilities was ſurpaſſed by none who ſwayed the ſceptre in this age, and who, in the beginning of theſe religious troubles, had oppoſed the doctrine and views of LUTHER with the utmoſt vehemence, was the principal agent in this great revolution [p]. Bound in the chains of matrimony to CATHARINE of *Arragon*, aunt to CHARLES V., but, at the ſame time, captivated by the charms of an illuſtrious virgin, whoſe name was ANNA BOLEYN, he ardently deſired to be divorced from the former, that he might render lawful his paſſion for the latter [q]. For this purpoſe, he addreſſed himſelf

---

[o] HERMANNI HAMMELMANNI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. renati Evangelii per inferiorem Saxoniam et Weſtphal.* part II. p. 1196. opp.—DE PRINTZ *Specimen Hiſtoriæ Anabapt.* c. x, xi, xii. p. 94.

☞ This ſect was, in proceſs of time, conſiderably reformed by the miniſtry of two Frieſlanders, UBBO and MENNON, who purified it from the enthuſiaſtic, ſeditious, and atrocious principles of its firſt founders, as will be ſeen in the progreſs of this hiſtory.

☞ [p] Among the various portraits that have been given by hiſtorians of HENRY VIII., there is none that equals the maſterly one drawn by Mr. HUME, in his *Hiſtory of England*, under the houſe of TUDOR. This great painter, whoſe colouring, in other ſubjects, is ſometimes more artful than accurate, has catched from nature the ſtriking lines of HENRY's motley character, and thrown them into a compoſition, in which they appear with the greateſt truth, ſet out with all the powers of expreſſion.

☞ [q] From Dr. MOSHEIM's manner of expreſſing himſelf, an uninformed reader might be led to conclude, that the charms of ANNA BOLEYN were the *only* motive that engaged HENRY to diſſolve his marriage with CATHARINE. But this repreſentation of the matter is not accurate. The king had entertained ſcruples concerning the legitimacy of his marriage, before his acquaintance with the beautiful and unfortunate ANNA. Converſant himſelf to the Roman pontif CLEMENT VII., in order to obtain a diſſolution of his marriage with CATHARINE, alleging, that a principle of religion reſtrained him from enjoying any longer the ſweets of connubial love with that princeſs, as ſhe had been previouſly married to his elder brother, ARTHUR, and as it was repugnant to the divine law to contract wedlock with a brother's widow. CLEMENT was greatly perplexed upon this occaſion, by the apprehenſion of incurring the indignation of the emperor in caſe his deciſion was favourable to HENRY; and therefore he contrived various pretexts to evade a poſitive anſwer, and exhauſted all his policy and artifice to cajole and deceive the Engliſh monarch. Tired with the pretexts, apologies, vain promiſes, and tardy proceedings of the Roman pontif, HENRY had recourſe, for the accompliſhment of his purpoſes, to an expedient which was ſuggeſted by the famous THOMAS CRANMER, who was a ſecret friend to LUTHER and his cauſe, and who was afterwards raiſed to the ſee of *Canterbury*. This expedient was, to demand the opinions of the moſt learned European univerſities concerning the ſubject of his ſcruples. The reſult of this meaſure was favourable to his views. The greateſt part of the univerſities de-

---

verſant in the writings of THOMAS AQUINAS and other ſchoolmen, who looked upon the Levitical law as of moral and permanent obligation, and attentive to the remonſtrances of the biſhops, who declared his marriage unlawful, the king was filled with anxious doubts, that had made him break off all conjugal commerce with the queen, before his affections had been engaged by any other. This appears by Cardinal WOLSEY's propoſing a marriage between his majeſty and the ſiſter of FRANCIS I., which that pliant courtier would never have done, had he known that the king's affections were otherwiſe engaged. After all, it is very poſſible, that the age and infirmities of CATHARINE, together with the blooming charms of ANNA BOLEYN, tended much to animate HENRY's remorſe, and to render his conſcience more ſcrupulous. See BURNET's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*. HUME's *Hiſtory of the Houſe of* TUDOR, p. 150.

clared the marriage with a brother's widow unlawful. CATHARINE was conſequently divorced; ANNA conducted by a formal marriage into the royal bed, notwithſtanding the remonſtances of CLEMENT; and the Engliſh nation delivered from the tyranny of *Rome*, by HENRY's renouncing the juriſdiction and ſupremacy of its imperious pontif. Soon after this, HENRY was declared by the parliament and people *ſupreme head, on earth, of the church of England*, the monaſteries were ſuppreſſed, and their revenues applied to other purpoſes; and the power and authority of the pope were abrogated and entirely overturned [r].

The nature and effects of this firſt ſtep towards the Reformation in *England*.

XII. It is however carefully to be obſerved here, that this downfal of the papal authority in *England* was not productive of much benefit either to the friends or to the cauſe of the Reformation. For the ſame monarch, who had ſo reſolutely withdrawn himſelf from the dominion of *Rome*, yet ſuperſtitiouſly retained the greateſt part of its errors, along with its imperious and perſecuting ſpirit. He ſtill adhered to ſeveral of the moſt monſtrous doctrines of popery, and frequently preſented the terrors of death to thoſe who differed from him in their religious ſentiments. Beſides, he conſidered the title of *Head of the Engliſh church*, as if it transferred to him the enormous power which had been claimed, and indeed uſurped, by the Roman pontifs; and, in conſequence of this interpretation of his title, he looked upon himſelf as maſter of the religious ſentiments of his ſubjects, and as authoriſed to preſcribe modes of faith according to his fancy. Hence it came to paſs, that, during the life and reign of this prince, the face of religion was conſtantly changing, and thus reſembled the capricious and unſteady character of its new chief. The prudence, learning, and activity of CRANMER, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who was the favourite of the king, and the friend of the Reformation, counteracted, however, in many inſtances, the humour and vehemence of this inconſtant and turbulent monarch. The pious productions and wiſe counſels of that venerable prelate diminiſhed daily the influence of the ancient ſuperſtitions, diſpelled by degrees the miſts of ignorance that blinded the people in favour of popery, and increaſed conſiderably the number of thoſe who wiſhed well to the Reformation [*s*].

---

[r] Beſides the full and accurate account of this and other important events that is to be found in Biſhop BURNET's excellent *Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Church of England*, the curious reader will do well to conſult the records of this memorable revolution in WILKINS's *Concil. Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, tom. iii. p. 424.—RAYNAL, *Anecdotes Hiſtoriques, Politiques, Militaires*, tom. i. part II. p. 90.—*Gen. Dictionary*, at the article BOLEYN.

A new project of pacification.

XIII. After the meeting of the council of *Mantua* was prevented, various meaſures were taken, and many ſchemes propoſed, by the emperor on the one hand, and the proteſtant princes on the other, for the reſtoration of concord and union, both civil and religious. But theſe meaſures and projects were unattended with any ſolid or ſalutary fruit, and were generally diſconcerted by the intrigues and artifice of *Rome*, whoſe legates and creatures were always lying in wait to blow the flame of diſcord in all thoſe councils that ſeemed unfavourable to the ambition of its pontifs. In the year 1541, the emperor, regardleſs of the biſhop of *Rome*, appointed a conference at *Worms*, on the ſubject of Religion, between perſons of piety and learning choſen out of each of the contending parties. It was here that MELANCTHON and ECKIUS diſputed during the ſpace of three

Conference of *Worms*.

[*s*] Beſides BURNET's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, ſee NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. chap. i. p. 11.

days.

Diet of *Ratiſbon.*

days [*t*]. This conference was, for certain reaſons, removed to the diet which was held at *Ratiſbon* that ſame year, and in which the principal ſubject of deliberation was a memorial, preſented by a perſon unknown, containing a project of peace, with the terms of accommodation that were proper to terminate theſe religious differences [*u*]. This conference, however, produced no other effect, than a mutual agreement of the contending parties to refer the deciſion of their pretenſions and debates to a general council; or, if the meeting of ſuch a council ſhould be prevented by any unforeſeen obſtacles, to the next German diet.

All things tend to an open rupture.

XIV. This reſolution was rendered ineffectual by the period of perplexity and trouble that ſucceeded the diet of *Ratiſbon*; and by various incidents that widened the breach, and put off to a farther day the deliberations that were deſigned to heal it. It is true, the Roman pontif ordered his legate to declare in the diet, which was aſſembled at *Spire* in the year 1542, that he would, according to the promiſe he had already made, aſſemble a general council, and that *Trent* ſhould be the place of its meeting, if the diet had no objection to that city. FERDINAND, king of the Romans, and the princes who adhered to the papal cauſe, gave their conſent to this propoſal; while the proteſtant members of the diet objected both againſt a council ſummoned by the papal authority alone, and alſo againſt the place appointed for its meeting, and demanded a free and lawful council, which ſhould not be biaſſed by the dictates, nor awed by the proximity of the Roman pontif. This proteſtation produced no effect; PAUL III. perſiſted in his purpoſe, and iſſued out his circular letters for the convocation of the council [*w*], with the approbation of the emperor; while this prince endeavoured, at the diet of *Worms*, in the year 1545, to perſuade the proteſtants to conſent

---

[*t*] See JO. ANDR. ROEDERI *Libellus de Colloquio Wormatienſi Norimb.* 1744, in 4to.

[*u*] See JO. ERDMANN BIECKII *Triplex Interim*, cap. i. p. 1.

☞ [*w*] It is proper to obſerve here, that, having ſummoned ſucceſſively a council at *Mantua*, *Vicenza*, and *Venice*, without any effect *, this pontif thought it neceſſary to ſhew the proteſtants that he was not averſe to every kind of reformation; and therefore appointed four cardinals, and five other perſons eminent for their learning, to draw up a plan for the reformation of the church in general, and of the church of *Rome* in particular, knowing full well, by the ſpirit which reigned in the conclave, that this project would come to nothing. A plan, however, was drawn up by the perſons appointed for that purpoſe. The reformation propoſed in this plan was indeed extremely ſuperficial and partial; yet it contains ſome particulars, which ſcarcely could have been expected from the pens of thoſe that compoſed it. They complained, for inſtance, of the pride and ignorance of the biſhops, and propoſed that none ſhould receive orders but learned and pious men; and that, therefore, care ſhould be taken to have proper maſters to inſtruct the youth. They condemned tranſlations from one benefice to another, grants of reſervation, non-reſidence, and pluralities. They propoſed, that ſome convents ſhould be aboliſhed; that the liberty of the preſs ſhould be reſtrained and limited; that the colloquies of ERASMUS ſhould be ſuppreſſed; that no eccleſiaſtic ſhould enjoy a benefice out of his own country; that no cardinal ſhould have a biſhopric; that the queſtors of St. ANTHONY, and ſeveral other ſaints, ſhould be aboliſhed; and, which was the beſt of all their propoſals, that the effects and perſonal eſtate of eccleſiaſtics ſhould be given to the poor. They concluded with complaining of the prodigious number of indigent and ragged prieſts that frequented St. PETER's church; and declared, that it was a great ſcandal to ſee the whores lodged ſo magnificently at *Rome*, and riding through the ſtreets on fine mules, while the cardinals and other eccleſiaſtics accompanied them in a moſt courteous and familiar manner. The ſeveral articles of this plan of reformation (which LUTHER and STURMIUS of *Straſburg* turned into ridicule, and which indeed left unredreſſed the moſt intolerable grievances of which the proteſtants complained) were publiſhed at *Antwerp* in or about the year 1539, with the anſwer of COCHLÆUS to the objections of STURMIUS. They are likewiſe prefixed to the *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, by CRABRE, and were afterwards publiſhed at *Paris* in 1612 †.

---

* This council was never aſſembled.

† See PAULIN, in *Paul* III. *Sleid.* l. xii. *Univerſ. Mod. Hiſt.* vol. xxvi. p. 30.

to the meeting of this council at *Trent*. But the proteſtants were fixed in their reſolution, and the efforts of CHARLES were vain. Upon which the emperor, who had hitherto diſapproved of the violent meaſures which were inceſſantly ſuggeſted by the court of *Rome*, departed from his uſual prudence and moderation, and, liſtening to the ſanguine counſels of PAUL, formed, in conjunction with that ſubtle pontif, the deſign of terminating the debates about religion by the force of arms. The landgrave of *Heſſe*, and the elector of *Saxony*, who were the chief protectors of the proteſtant cauſe, were no ſooner informed of this, than they took the proper meaſures to prevent their being ſurpriſed and overwhelmed unawares by a ſuperior force, and, accordingly, raiſed an army for their defence. While this terrible ſtorm was riſing, LUTHER, whoſe averſion to all methods of violence and force in matters of religion was well known, and who recommended prayer and patience as the only arms worthy of thoſe who had the cauſe of genuine Chriſtianity at heart, was removed by Providence from this ſcene of tumult, and the approaching calamities that threatened his country. He died in peace, on the 18th of February, in the year 1546, at *Ayſleben*, the place of his birth.

CHAP. IV.

The Hiſtory of the Reformation, from the commencement of the war of Smalcald *to the famous Pacification, commonly called the* PEACE OF RELIGION, *concluded at* Augſburg.

The commencement of the war of *Smalcald*.

I. THE emperor and the pope had mutually reſolved the deſtruction of all who ſhould dare to oppoſe the council of *Trent*. The meeting of that aſſembly was to ſerve as a ſignal for their taking arms; and, accordingly, its deliberations were ſcarcely begun, in the year 1546, when the proteſtants perceived undoubted marks of the approaching ſtorm, and of a formidable union between the emperor and the pontif to overwhelm and cruſh them by a ſudden blow. There had been, it is true, a new conference this very year, at the diet of *Ratiſbon*, between ſome eminent doctors of both parties, with a view to the accommodation of their religious differences; but it appeared ſufficiently, both from the nature of this diſpute, the manner it was carried on, and its iſſue and reſult, that the matters in debate would, ſooner or later, be decided in the field of battle. In the mean time, the fathers, aſſembled in the council of *Trent*, promulgated their decrees: while the proteſtant princes in the diet of *Ratiſbon* proteſted againſt their authority, and were, in conſequence of this, proſcribed by the emperor, who raiſed an army to reduce them to obedience.

The affairs of the proteſtants take an unfavourable turn.

II. The elector of *Saxony* and the landgrave of *Heſſe* led their forces into *Bavaria* againſt the emperor, and cannonaded his camp at *Ingolſtad* with great ſpirit. It was ſuppoſed that this would bring the two armies to a general action; but ſeveral circumſtances prevented a battle, which was expected by the moſt of the confederates, and, probably, would have been advantageous to their cauſe. Among theſe we may reckon, principally, the perfidy of MAURICE, duke of *Saxony*, who, ſeduced by the promiſes of the emperor on the one hand, and by his own ambition and avarice on the other, invaded the electoral dominions of his uncle JOHN FREDERICK, while that worthy prince was maintaining againſt the emperor the ſacred cauſe of religion and liberty. Add to this the diviſions that were fomented by the diſſimulation of the emperor among the confederate princes; the failure of *France* in furniſhing the ſubſidy that had been promiſed by its monarch; and other incidents of leſs moment. All theſe things diſcouraged ſo the heads of the proteſtant party, that their army was ſoon diſperſed, and the elector of *Saxony* directed his march homewards. But he was purſued by the emperor, who made ſeveral forced marches, with a view to deſtroy his enemy, before he ſhould have time to recover his vigour; in which deſign he was aſſiſted by the ill-grounded ſecurity of the elector, and, as there is too much reaſon to think, by the treachery of his officers. The two armies drew up in order of battle near *Muhlberg* on the *Elbe*, on the 24th of April, 1547; and, after a bloody action, that of the elector, being inferior in numbers, was entirely defeated, and himſelf taken priſoner. PHILIP, landgrave of *Heſſe*, the other chief of the proteſtants, was perſuaded by the entreaties of his ſon-in-law, MAURICE, now declared elector of *Saxony* [*x*], to throw himſelf upon the mercy of the emperor, and to implore his pardon. To this he conſented, relying on the promiſe of CHARLES for obtaining forgiveneſs, and being reſtored to liberty; but, notwithſtanding theſe expectations, he was unjuſtly detained priſoner by a ſcandalous violation of the moſt ſolemn convention. It is ſaid, that the emperor retracted his promiſe, and deluded this unhappy prince by the ambiguity of two German words, which reſemble each other [*y*]; but this point

---

☞ [*x*] In the room of JOHN FREDERICK, whom he had ſo baſely betrayed.

☞ [*y*] There is ſcarcely in hiſtory any inſtance of ſuch a mean, perfidious, and deſpotic behaviour as that of the emperor to the landgrave in the caſe now before us. After having received in public the humble ſubmiſſions of that unhappy prince, made upon his knees, and that in the moſt reſpectful and affecting terms, and after having ſet him at liberty by a ſolemn treaty, he had him arreſted anew, without alleging any reaſon, nay any pretext, and kept him for ſeveral years in a cloſe and ſevere confinement. When MAURICE remonſtrated point of hiſtory has not been hitherto ſo far cleared up, as to enable us to judge with certainty concerning the confinement of this prince, and the real cauſes to which it was owing [z].

The famous temporary edict, called the *Interim*.

III. This revolution ſeemed every way adapted to complete the ruin of the proteſtant cauſe, and to crown the efforts of the Roman pontif with the moſt triumphant ſucceſs. In the diet of *Augſburg*, which was aſſembled ſoon after, with an imperial army at hand to promote union and diſpatch, the emperor required of the proteſtants, that they would leave the deciſion of theſe religious conteſts to the wiſdom of the council that was to meet at *Trent*. The greateſt part of the members conſented to this propoſal; and, among others, MAURICE, the new elector of *Saxony*, who owed both his electorate and his dominions to the emperor, and who was ardently deſirous of obtaining the liberty of his father-in-law the landgrave of *Heſſe*. This general ſubmiſſion to the will of the emperor did not, however, produce the fruits that were expected from ſuch a ſolemn and almoſt univerſal approbation of the council of *Trent*. A plague, which manifeſted itſelf, or was ſaid to do ſo, in that city, engaged the greateſt part of the aſſembled fathers to retire to *Bologna*, and thereby the council was, in effect, diſſolved; nor could all the entreaties and remonſtrances of the emperor prevail upon the pope to re-aſſemble it again

---

ſtrated to the emperor againſt this new impriſonment, the emperor anſwered, that he had never promiſed that the landgrave ſhould not be *impriſoned anew*, but only that he ſhould be exempted from *perpetual impriſonment*; and, to ſupport this aſſertion, he produced the treaty, in which his miniſters, in order to elude the true meaning of the accommodation, had perfidiouſly foiſted in *ewiger gefangnis*, which ſignifies a *perpetual priſon*, inſtead of *einiger gefangnis*, which means *any priſon*. This matter is, however, conteſted by ſome hiſtorians.

[z] See a German work, entitled, BENI GROSCH *Vertheidigung* der *Evangeliſchen Kirken gegen Gottfr. Arnold*. p. 29.

without delay. While things were in this ſituation, and the proſpect of ſeeing a council aſſembled was caſt at a diſtance, the emperor judged it neceſſary, during this *interval*, to fall upon ſome method of maintaining peace in religious matters, until the deciſion, ſo long expected, ſhould be finally obtained. It was with this view that he ordered JULIUS PFLUGIUS, biſhop of *Naumburg*, MICHAEL SIDONIUS, a creature of the pontif, and JOHN AGRICOLA, a native of *Ayſleben*, to draw up a *Formulary*, which might ſerve as a rule of faith and worſhip to both of the contending parties, until a council ſhould be ſummoned. As this was only a temporary appointment, and had not the force of a permanent or perpetual inſtitution, the rule in queſtion was called the *Interim* [a].

IV. This

☞ [a] This project of CHARLES was formed, partly to vent his reſentment againſt the pope, and partly to anſwer other purpoſes of a more political kind. Be that as it may, the *Formula ad Interim*, or Temporary Rule of Faith and Worſhip, here mentioned, contained all the eſſential doctrines of the church of *Rome*, though conſiderably ſoftened and mitigated by the moderate, prudent, and artful terms in which they were expreſſed; terms quite different from thoſe that were employed, before and after this period, by the council of *Trent*. There was even an affected ambiguity in many expreſſions, which rendered them ſuſceptible of different ſenſes, applicable to the ſentiments of both communions, and therefore diſagreeable to both. The *Interim* was compoſed with that fraudulent, ſpecious, and ſeducing dexterity, that in after-times appeared in the deceitful *Expoſition of the Catholic Faith*, by M. BOSSUET, biſhop of *Meaux*, and it was almoſt equally rejected by the proteſtants and Roman catholics. The *cup* was allowed, by this Imperial Creed, to the proteſtants in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper, and prieſts and clerks were permitted by it to enter into the married ſtate. Theſe grants were, however, accompanied with the two following conditions: 1. *That every one ſhould be at liberty to uſe the cup, or to abſtain from it, and to chooſe a ſtate of marriage, or a ſtate of celibacy, as he ſhould judge moſt fitting.* 2. *That theſe grants ſhould remain in force no longer than the happy period when a general council ſhould terminate all religious differences.* This ſecond condition was adapted to produce the greateſt diſorder and

The troubles to which this edict gave riſe.

IV. This temporary rule of faith and diſcipline, though it was extremely favourable to the intereſts and pretenſions of the court of *Rome*, had yet the fate to which ſchemes of reconciliation are often expoſed; it pleaſed neither of the contending parties, but was equally offenſive to the followers of Luther, and to the Roman pontif. It was, however, promulgated with ſolemnity by the emperor, at the diet of *Augſburg*; and the elector of *Mentz*, without even deigning to aſk the opinions of the aſſembled princes and ſtates, roſe with an air of authority, and, as if he had been commiſſioned to repreſent the whole diet, gave a formal and public approbation to this famous *Interim*. Thus were many princes of the empire, whoſe ſilence, though it proceeded from want of courage, was interpreted as the mark of a tacit conſent, engaged againſt their will to receive this *book* as a body of eccleſiaſtical law. The greateſt part of thoſe, who had the reſolution to diſpute the authority of this Imperial Creed, were obliged to ſubmit to it by the force of arms, and hence aroſe deplorable ſcenes of violence and bloodſhed, which involved the empire in the greateſt calamities. Maurice, elector of *Saxony*, who, for ſome time, had held a neutral conduct, and neither declared himſelf for thoſe who rejected, nor for thoſe who had adopted the *rule* in queſtion, aſſembled, in the year 1548, the Saxon nobility and clergy, with Melancthon at the head of the latter, and, in ſeveral conferences held at *Leipſic* and other places, took counſel concerning what was to be done

---

and confuſion, in caſe the future council ſhould think proper to enjoin celibacy on the clergy, and declare, as it did in effect, their marriage unchriſtian and unlawful.

[*a*] See Jo. Erdm. Bieckii *Triplex Interim*, publiſhed in 8vo. at *Leipſic*, in the year 1721.—Luc. Osiander *Centuria* XVI. *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. lxviii. p. 425.—For an account of the authors and editions of the book called *Interim*, ſee *Die Daniſche Biblioth.* part V. p. 1. & part VI. p. 185.

done in this critical affair. The deliberations, on this occaſion, were long and tedious, and their reſult was ambiguous; for MELANCTHON, whoſe opinion was reſpected as a law by the reformed doctors, fearing the emperor on the one hand, and attentive to the ſentiments of his ſovereign on the other, pronounced a ſort of a reconciling ſentence, which, he hoped, would be offenſive to no party. He gave it as his opinion, that the whole of the book called *Interim* could not, by any means, be adopted by the friends of the Reformation; but he declared, at the ſame time, that he ſaw no reaſon, why this book might not be approved, adopted, and received, as an authoritative rule, in things that did not relate to the eſſential points of religion, in things that might be conſidered as acceſſory or *indifferent* [b]. This deciſion, inſtead of pacifying matters, produced, on the contrary, new diviſions, and formed a ſchiſm among the followers of LUTHER, of which farther mention ſhall be made hereafter, in the *Hiſtory of the Church* eſtabliſhed by that reformer. I ſhall only obſerve, that this ſchiſm placed the cauſe of the Reformation in the moſt perilous and critical circumſtances, and might have contributed either to ruin it entirely, or to retard conſiderably its progreſs, had the pope and the emperor been dexterous enough to make the proper uſe of theſe diviſions, and to ſeize the favourable occaſion that was preſented to them, of turning the force of the proteſtants againſt themſelves.

The project of a council at *Trent* renewed.

V. Amidſt theſe conteſts PAUL III. departed this life in the year 1549, and was ſucceeded, the year following, by JULIUS III., who, yielding to

---

☞ [b] By things *indifferent*, MELANCTHON underſtood particularly the rites and ceremonies of the popiſh worſhip, which, ſuperſtitious as they were, that reformer, yielding to the ſoftneſs and flexibility of his natural temper, treated with a ſingular and exceſſive indulgence upon this occaſion.

the repeated and importunate ſolicitations of the emperor, conſented to the aſſembling a council at *Trent*. Accordingly, in the diet of *Augſburg*, which was again held under the canon of an Imperial army, CHARLES laid this matter before the ſtates and princes of the empire. The greateſt part of the princes gave their conſent to the convocation of this council, to which alſo MAURICE, elector of *Saxony*, ſubmitted upon certain conditions [*c*]. The emperor then concluded the diet in the year 1551, deſiring the aſſembled princes and ſtates to prepare all things for the approaching council, and promiſing that he would uſe his moſt zealous endeavours towards the promoting moderation and harmony, impartiality and charity, in the deliberations and tranſactions of that aſſembly. Upon the breaking up of the diet, the proteſtants took the ſteps they judged moſt prudent to prepare themſelves for what was to happen. The Saxons employed the pen of MELANCTHON, and the Wurtemberghers that of BREDTIUS, to draw up *confeſſions* of their faith, that were to be laid before the new council. Beſides the ambaſſadors of the duke of *Wurtemberg*, ſeveral doctors of that city repaired to *Trent*. The Saxon divines, with MELANCTHON at their head,

---

☞ [*c*] MAURICE (who was deſirous of regaining the eſteem of the proteſtants of *Saxony*, which he had loſt by his perfidious behaviour to the late elector JOHN FREDERICK, his benefactor and friend) gave his conſent to the re-eſtabliſhing the council of *Trent*, upon the following conditions: 1*ſt*, That the points of doctrine, which had been already decided there, ſhould be re-examined, and diſcuſſed anew: 2*dly*, That this examination ſhould be made in preſence of the proteſtant divines, or their deputies. 3*dly*, That the Saxon proteſtants ſhould have a liberty of *voting*, as well as of *deliberating*, in the council: and 4*thly*, That the pope ſhould not pretend to preſide in that aſſembly, either in perſon or by his legates. This declaration of MAURICE was read in the diet, and his deputies inſiſted upon its being entered into the regiſters, which the archbiſhop of *Mentz*, however, obſtinately refuſed.

ſet out alſo for that place, but proceeded in their journey no further than *Nuremberg*. They had received ſecret orders to ſtop there; for MAURICE had no intention of ſubmitting to the emperor's views; on the contrary, he hoped to reduce that prince to a compliance with his own projects. He therefore yielded in appearance, that he might carry his point, and thus command in reality.

Maurice diſconcerts the ſchemes of the emperor.

VI. The real views of CHARLES V., amidſt the diviſions and troubles of *Germany* (which he fomented by negociations that carried the outward aſpect of a reconciling ſpirit), will appear evidently to ſuch as conſider attentively the nature of the times, and compare the tranſactions of this prince, the one with the other. Relying on the extent of his power, and the ſucceſs that frequently accompanied his enterprizes, with a degree of confidence that was highly imprudent, CHARLES propoſed to turn theſe religious commotions and diſſenſions to the confirmation and increaſe of his dominion in *Germany*, and by ſowing the ſeeds of diſcord among the princes of the empire, to weaken their power, and thereby the more eaſily to encroach upon their rights and privileges. On the other hand, ardently deſirous of reducing within narrower limits the juriſdiction and dominion of the Roman pontifs, that they might not ſet bounds to his ambition, nor prevent the execution of his aſpiring views, he flattered himſelf that this would be the natural effect of the approaching council. He was confirmed in this pleaſing hope, by reflecting on what had happened in the councils of *Conſtance* and of *Baſil*, in which the luſt of papal ambition had been oppoſed with ſpirit, and reſtrained within certain limits. He alſo perſuaded himſelf, that, by the dexterity of his agents, and the number of the Spaniſh and German biſhops that were devoted to his intereſts, he ſhould be able to influence and direct the deliberations of the approaching council in ſuch a manner, as to make its deciſions anſwer his expectations, and contribute effectually to the accompliſhment of his views. Such were the ſpecious dreams of ambition that filled the imagination of this reſtleſs prince; but his views and projects were diſconcerted by that ſame MAURICE of *Saxony*, who had been one of the principal inſtruments of that violence and oppreſſion which he had exerciſed againſt the proteſtant princes, and of the injury he had done to the proteſtant cauſe.

A war kindled between the emperor and Maurice of *Saxony*.

VII. The moſt conſiderable princes, not only of *Germany*, but even of all *Europe*, had, for a long time, addreſſed to the emperor their united entreaties for the deliverance of PHILIP, landgrave of *Heſſe*, and JOHN FREDERICK, elector of *Saxony*, from their confinement; and MAURICE had ſolicited, with peculiar warmth and aſſiduity, the liberty of the former, who was his father-in-law. But all theſe ſolicitations produced no effect. MAURICE, perceiving at length that he was duped by the emperor, and alſo convinced that this ambitious monarch was forming inſidious deſigns upon the liberties of *Germany*, and the juriſdiction of its princes, entered, with the utmoſt ſecrecy and expedition, into an alliance with the king of *France* and ſeveral of the German princes, for the maintenance of the rights and liberties of the empire. Encouraged by this reſpectable confederacy, the active Saxon marched a powerful army againſt the emperor, in the year 1552; and that with ſuch aſtoniſhing valour and rapidity, that he ſurpriſed CHARLES at *Inſpruk*, where he lay with a handful of troops in the utmoſt ſecurity, and without the leaſt apprehenſion of danger. This ſudden and unforeſeen event alarmed and dejected the emperor to ſuch a degree, that he was willing to make peace on almoſt any conditions; and conſequently, in a little time after this, he not only concluded at

Paſſau the famous treaty of *Pacification* with the proteſtants [*d*], but alſo promiſed to aſſemble, in the ſpace of ſix months, a diet, in which all the tumults and diſſenſions that had been occaſioned by a variety of ſentiments in religious matters ſhould be entirely removed. Thus did the ſame prince, who ſtands foremoſt in the liſt of thoſe that oppreſſed the proteſtants, and reduced their affairs to the greateſt extremities, reſtore their expiring hopes, ſupport and render triumphant their deſperate cauſe, and procure them a bulwark of peace and liberty, which ſtill remains. MAURICE, however, did not live to ſee this happy iſſue of his glorious expedition; for he loſt his life the year following, by a wound received at the battle of *Siverhauſen*, while he was fighting againſt ALBERT of *Brandenburg* [*e*].

☞ [*d*] As this treaty is conſidered by the German proteſtants as the baſis of their religious liberty, it will not be amiſs to inſert here ſome of its principal articles. By the three firſt articles it was ſtipulated, that MAURICE and the confederates ſhould lay down their arms, and ſhould lend their troops to FERDINAND to defend him againſt the Turks, and that the landgrave of *Heſſe* ſhould be ſet at liberty. By the fourth it was agreed, that the rule of faith called *Interim*, ſhould be conſidered as null and void; that the contending parties ſhould enjoy the free and undiſturbed exerciſe of their religion, until a diet ſhould be aſſembled to determine amicably the preſent diſputes (which diet was to meet in the ſpace of ſix months); and that this religious liberty ſhould continue always, in caſe that it ſhould be found impoſſible to come to an uniformity in doctrine and worſhip. It was alſo reſolved, that all thoſe who had ſuffered baniſhment, or any other calamity, on account of their having been concerned in the league or war of *Smalcald*, ſhould be re-inſtated in their privileges, their poſſeſſions, and employments; that the Imperial chamber at *Spire* ſhould be open to the proteſtants as well as to the catholics; and that there ſhould be always a certain number of the Lutheran perſuaſion in that high court.

☞ [*e*] ALBERT, marquis of *Brandenburg*, after the pacification of *Paſſau*, to which he refuſed to ſubſcribe, continued the war againſt the Roman catholics; and afterwards committed ſuch ravages in the empire, that a confederacy was formed againſt him, at the head of which MAURICE was placed.

The Diet of *Augſburg*, and the peace of religion.

VIII. The troubles of *Germany*, with ſeveral other incidents, rendered it impoſſible to aſſemble the Diet, which the emperor had promiſed at the pacification of *Paſſau*, ſo ſoon as the period mentioned in the articles of that treaty. This famous Diet met, however, at *Augſburg*, in the year 1555, was opened by FERDINAND in the name of the emperor, and terminated thoſe deplorable ſcenes of bloodſhed, deſolation, and diſcord, that had ſo long afflicted both church and ſtate, by that *religious peace*, as it is commonly called, which ſecured to the proteſtants the free exerciſe of their religion, and eſtabliſhed this ineſtimable liberty upon the firmeſt foundations. For, after various debates, the following memorable acts were paſſed on the 25th of September: that the proteſtants who followed the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, ſhould be for the future conſidered as entirely exempt from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, and from the authority and ſuperintendance of the biſhops; that they were left at perfect liberty to enact laws for themſelves, relating to their religious ſentiments, diſcipline, and worſhip; that all the inhabitants of the German empire ſhould be allowed to judge for themſelves in religious matters, and to join themſelves to that church whoſe doctrine and worſhip they thought the pureſt and the moſt conſonant to the ſpirit of true Chriſtianity; and that all thoſe who ſhould injure or perſecute any perſon under religious pretexts, and on account of their opinions, ſhould be declared, and proceeded againſt, as public enemies of the empire, invaders of its liberty, and diſturbers of its peace [*f*]. The difficulties that were to be ſurmounted before this equitable deciſion could be procured, the tedious deliberations, the warm debates, the violent animoſities and bloody wars, that were neceſſary to engage the greateſt part of the German ſtates to conſent to conditions ſo agreeable to the dictates of right reaſon, as well as to the ſacred injunctions of the goſpel, ſhew us, in a ſhocking and glaring point of light, the ignorance and ſuperſtition, of theſe miſerable times, and ſtand upon record as one of the moſt evident proofs of the neceſſity of the Reformation.

[*f*] See JO. SCHILTERI *Liber de Pace Religioſa*, publiſhed in 4to. in the year 1700.—CHRIST. LEHMANNI *Acta publica et originalia de Pace Religioſa*. *Francf.* 1707.

The Reformation gains ground in *England*.

IX. While theſe things were tranſacting in *Germany*, the friends of genuine Chriſtianity in *England* deplored the gloomy reign of ſuperſtition, and the almoſt total extinction of true religion; and, ſeeing before their eyes the cauſe of popery maintained by the terrors of bloody perſecution, and daily victims brought to the ſtake, to expiate the pretended crime of preferring the dictates of the Goſpel to the deſpotic laws of *Rome*, they eſteemed the Germans happy, in having thrown off the yoke of an imperious and ſuperſtitious church. HENRY VIII., whoſe perſonal vices, as well as his arbitrary and capricious conduct, had greatly retarded the progreſs of the Reformation, was now no more. He departed this life in the year 1547, and was ſucceeded by his only ſon EDWARD VI. This amiable prince, whoſe early youth was crowned with that wiſdom, ſagacity, and virtue, that would have done honour to advanced years, gave new ſpirit and vigour to the proteſtant cauſe, and was its brighteſt ornament, as well as its moſt effectual ſupport. He encouraged learned and pious men of foreign countries to ſettle in *England*, and addreſſed a particular invitation to MARTIN BUCER and PAUL FAGIUS, whoſe moderation added a luſtre to their other virtues, that, by the miniſtry and labours of theſe eminent men, in concert with thoſe of the friends of the Reformation in *England*, he might purge his dominions from the ſordid fictions of popery, and eſtabliſh the pure doctrines of Chriſtianity in their place. For this purpoſe he iſſued out the wiſeſt orders for the reſtoration of true religion; but his reign was too ſhort to accompliſh fully ſuch a glorious purpoſe. In the year 1553, he was taken from his loving and afflicted ſubjects, whoſe ſorrow was inexpreſſible, and ſuited to their loſs. His ſiſter MARY (the daughter of CATHARINE of *Arragon*, from whom HENRY had been ſeparated by the famous divorce), a furious bigot to the church of *Rome*, and a princeſs whoſe natural character, like the ſpirit of her religion, was deſpotic and cruel, ſucceeded him on the Britiſh throne, and impoſed anew the arbitrary laws and the tyrannical yoke of *Rome* upon the people of *England*. Nor were the methods ſhe employed, in the cauſe of ſuperſtition, better than the cauſe itſelf, or tempered by any ſentiments of equity or compaſſion. Barbarous tortures, and death in the moſt ſhocking forms, awaited thoſe who oppoſed her will, or made the leaſt ſtand againſt the reſtoration of popery. And among many other victims, the learned and pious CRANMER, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who had been one of the moſt illuſtrious inſtruments of the Reformation in *England*, fell a ſacrifice to her fury. This odious ſcene of perſecution was happily concluded, in the year 1558, by the death of the queen, who left no iſſue; and, as ſoon as her ſucceſſor the lady ELIZABETH aſcended the throne, all things aſſumed a new and a pleaſing aſpect. This illuſtrious princeſs, whoſe ſentiments, councils, and projects breathed a ſpirit ſuperior to the natural ſoftneſs and delicacy of her ſex, exerted this vigorous and manly ſpirit in the defence of oppreſſed conſcience and expiring liberty, broke anew the deſpotic yoke of papal authority and ſuperſtition, and, delivering her people from the bondage of

Rome, eſtabliſhed that form of religious doctrine and eccleſiaſtical government which ſtill ſubſiſts in *England*. This religious eſtabliſhment differs, in ſome reſpects, from the plan that had been formed by thoſe whom EDWARD VI. had employed for promoting the cauſe of the Reformation, and approaches nearer to the rites and diſcipline of former times; though it is widely different, and in the moſt important points entirely oppoſite, to the principles of the Roman hierarchy.

In *Scotland*.

X. The ſeeds of the Reformation were very early ſown in *Scotland*, by ſeveral noblemen of that nation, who had reſided in *Germany* during the religious diſputes that divided the empire. But the power of the Roman pontif, ſupported and ſeconded by inhuman laws and barbarous executions, choked, for many years, theſe tender ſeeds, and prevented their taking root. The firſt and moſt eminent oppoſer of the papal juriſdiction was JOHN KNOX [g], a diſciple of CALVIN, whoſe eloquence

---

☞ [g] It will not be improper to inſert here the character of this famous Scottiſh reformer, as it is drawn by the elegant, ſpirited, accurate, and impartial pen of Dr. ROBERTSON, in his *Hiſtory of Scotland*, book VI. "Zeal, intrepidity, diſintereſtedneſs (ſays that incomparable writer) were virtues "which he poſſeſſed in an eminent degree. He was acquainted, too, with the learning cultivated in that age; "and excelled in that ſpecies of eloquence which is calculated "to rouſe and to inflame. His maxims, however, were often "too ſevere, and the impetuoſity of his temper exceſſive. "Rigid and uncomplying himſelf, he ſhewed no indulgence "to the infirmities of others. Regardleſs of the diſtinctions "of rank and character, he uttered his admonitions with an "acrimony and vehemence more apt to irritate than to reclaim. This often betrayed him into indecent and undutiful expreſſions with reſpect to the queen's perſon and conduct. Thoſe very qualities, however, which now rendered his character leſs amiable, fitted him to be the inſtrument of Providence for advancing the Reformation "among a fierce people, and enabled him to face dangers, "and to ſurmount oppoſition, from which a perſon of a more "gentle ſpirit would have been apt to ſhrink back.' By an "unwearied eloquence was perſuaſive, and whoſe fortitude was invincible [*h*]. This reſolute reformer ſet out from *Geneva* for *Scotland* in the year 1559, and, in a very ſhort ſpace of time, inſpired the people, by his private exhortations and his public diſcourſes, with ſuch a violent averſion to the ſuperſtitions of *Rome*, that the greateſt part of the Scotch nation abandoned them entirely, and aimed at nothing leſs than the total extirpation of popery [*i*]. From this period to the preſent times, the form of doctrine, worſhip, and diſcipline, that had been eſtabliſhed at *Geneva* by the miniſtry of CALVIN, has been maintained in *Scotland* with invincible obſtinacy and zeal, and every attempt to introduce into that kingdom the rites and government of the church of *England* has proved impotent and unſucceſsful [*k*].

XI. The

“ unwearied application to ſtudy and to buſineſs, as well as
“ by the frequency and fervour of his public diſcourſes, he
“ had worn out a conſtitution naturally ſtrong. During a
“ lingering illneſs, he diſcovered the utmoſt fortitude, and
“ met the approaches of death with a magnanimity inſepara-
“ ble from his character. He was conſtantly employed in
“ acts of devotion, and comforted himſelf with thoſe pro-
“ ſpects of immortality, which not only preſerve good men
“ from deſponding, but fill them with exultation in their laſt
“ moments.

☞ [*h*] The earl of MORTON, who was preſent at his funeral, pronounced his eulogium in a few words, the more honourable for KNOX, as they came from one whom he had often cenſured with peculiar ſeverity: *There lies He who never feared the face of man.*

[*i*] See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 165, 232, 234, 569.—CALDERWOOD's *Hiſtory of Scotland's Reformation*, publiſhed in folio at *London*, in the year 1680.—GEORG. BUCHANANI *Rerum Scoticar. Hiſt.* lib. xvi. p. 313. edit. *Rudimann*. folio.—MELVIL's *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 73.

☞ [*k*] The indignation of the people, which had been excited by the *vices* of the clergy, was ſoon transferred to their *perſons*, and ſettled at laſt, by a tranſition not unuſual, upon the *offices* they enjoyed; and thus the effects of the Reformation extended not only to the doctrine, but alſo to the government of the popiſh church. But in *Germany*, *England*, and the

In *Ireland.*

XI. The cauſe of the Reformation underwent, in *Ireland*, the ſame viciſſitudes and revolutions that

the northern kingdoms, its operations were checked by the power and policy of their princes, and epiſcopal hierarchy (which appears to be the moſt conformable to the practice of the church, ſince Chriſtianity became the eſtabliſhed religion of the Roman empire), was ſtill continued, in theſe countries, under certain limitations. The eccleſiaſtical government was copied after the civil; and the dioceſes and juriſdiction of patriarchs, archbiſhops, and biſhops, correſponded with the diviſion and conſtitution of the empire. In *Switzerland* and the *Low Countries*, the nature and ſpirit of a republican policy gave fuller ſcope to the reformers; and thus all pre-eminence of order in the church was deſtroyed, and that form of eccleſiaſtical government eſtabliſhed, which has been ſince called *Preſbyterian*. The ſituation of the primitive church (oppreſſed by continual perſecutions, and obliged by their ſufferings to be contented with a form of government extremely ſimple, and with a parity of rank for want of ambition to propoſe, or power to ſupport, a ſubordination) ſuggeſted, without doubt, the idea of this latter ſyſtem; though it would be unfair to allege this conſideration, as a victorious argument in favour of *preſbyterianiſm*; becauſe a change of circumſtances will ſometimes juſtify a change in the methods and plans of government. Be that as it may, the church of *Geneva*, which received the deciſions of CALVIN with an amazing docility, reſtored this *Preſbyterian*, or republican form of eccleſiaſtical policy; KNOX ſtudied, admired, and recommended it to his countrymen, and he was ſeconded by many of the Scotch nobles, of whom ſome hated the perſons, while others coveted the wealth of the dignified clergy. But, in introducing this ſyſtem, the Scottiſh reformer did not deem it expedient to depart altogether from the ancient form; but inſtead of *biſhops*, propoſed the eſtabliſhment of ten *ſuperintendants*, to inſpect the life and doctrine of the other clergy, to preſide in the inferior judicatories of the church, without pretending to claim either a ſeat in parliament, or the revenues and dignity of the former biſhops. This propoſal was drawn up and preſented to a convention of eſtates, which was held in the year 1561; and what it contained, in relation to eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction and diſcipline, would have eaſily obtained the ſanction of that aſſembly, had not a deſign to recover the patrimony of the church, in order to apply it to the advancement of religion and learning, been inſinuated in it. After this, at certain periods, the name of biſhops was revived, but without the prerogatives, juriſdiction, or revenues, that were formerly appropriated to that order. They were made ſubject to the general that had attended it in *England.* When HENRY VIII., after the abolition of the papal authority, was declared *ſupreme head, upon earth, of the church of England,* GEORGE BROWN, a native of *England,* and a monk of the Auguſtine order, whom that monarch had created, in the year 1535, archbiſhop of *Dublin,* began to act with the utmoſt vigour in conſequence of this change in the hierarchy. He purged the churches of his dioceſe from ſuperſtition in all its various forms, pulled down images, deſtroyed relicks, aboliſhed abſurd and idolatrous rites, and, by the influence, as well as authority, he had in *Ireland,* cauſed the king's *ſupremacy* to be acknowledged in that nation [*l*]. HENRY ſhewed ſoon after, that this ſupremacy was not a vain title; for he baniſhed the monks out of that kingdom, confiſcated their revenues, and deſtroyed their convents. In the reign

---

general aſſemblies of the clergy, and their power was diminiſhed from day to day, until their name, as well as their order, was aboliſhed, at the Revolution in 1688, and *preſbyterianiſm* eſtabliſhed in *Scotland* by the laws of the ſtate. See ROBERTSON's *Hiſtory of Scotland,* paſſim.

☞ [*l*] The learned and pious primate USHER, in his Memoirs of the eccleſiaſtical affairs of *Ireland,* ſpeaks of biſhop BROWN in the following manner: "GEORGE BROWN was a "man of a chearful countenance, in his acts and deeds plain "downright, to the poor merciful and compaſſionate, pitying "the ſtate and condition of the ſouls of the people, and adviſing them, when he was provincial of the Auguſtine order "in *England,* to make their application ſolely to CHRIST; "which advice coming to the ears of HENRY VIII., he became a favourite, and was made archbiſhop of *Dublin.* "Within five years after he enjoyed that ſee, he cauſed all "ſuperſtitious relicks and images to be removed out of the "two cathedrals in *Dublin,* and out of all the churches in his "dioceſe; and cauſed the *Ten Commandments,* the *Lord's* "*Prayer,* and the *Creed,* to be placed in gilded frames about "the altars. He was the firſt that turned from the Romiſh "religion of the clergy here in *Ireland,* to embrace the Reformation of the church of *England.*" See a very curious pamphlet in the fifth volume of the *Harleian Miſcellany,* p. 558. intitled, *Hiſtorical Collections of the Church of Ireland,* &c.

reign of EDWARD VI., ſtill farther progreſs was made in the removal of popiſh ſuperſtitions, by the zealous labours of biſhop BROWN, and the auſpicious encouragement he granted to all who exerted themſelves in the cauſe of the reformation. But the death of this excellent prince, and the acceſſion of his ſiſter to the throne, changed the face of things in *Ireland*, as it had done in *England* [m]. MARY purſued with fire and ſword, and

---

☞ [m] Here Dr. MOSHEIM has fallen into a miſtake, by not diſtinguiſhing between the *deſigns* of the queen, which were indeed cruel, and their *execution*, which was happily and providentially prevented. This appears from a very ſingular and comical adventure, of which the account, as it has been copied from the papers of RICHARD, earl of CORK, and is to be found among the manuſcripts of Sir JAMES WARE, is as follows:

" Queen MARY, having dealt ſeverely with the proteſtants " in *England*, about the latter end of her reign ſigned a com- " miſſion for to take the ſame courſe with them in *Ireland*; " and, to execute the ſame with greater force, ſhe nominates " Dr. COLE one of the commiſſioners. This doctor coming " with the commiſſion to *Cheſter* on his journey, the mayor of " that city, hearing that her majeſty was ſending a meſſenger " into *Ireland*, and he being a churchman, waited on the " doctor, who, in diſcourſe with the mayor, taketh out " of a clokebag a leather box, ſaying unto him, *Here is a com-* " *miſſion that ſhall laſh the heretics of Ireland* (calling the pro- " teſtants by that title). The good woman of the houſe, being " well affected to the proteſtant religion, and alſo having a " brother named JOHN EDMONDS of the ſame, then a citizen " in *Dublin*, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but " watching her convenient time, while the mayor took his " leave, and the doctor complimented him down the ſtairs, " ſhe opens the box, takes the commiſſion out, and places in " lieu thereof a ſheet of paper, with a pack of cards wrapt " up therein, the knave of clubs being faced uppermoſt. " The doctor coming up to his chamber, ſuſpecting nothing " of what had been done, put up the box as formerly. The " next day going to the water-ſide, wind and weather ſerving " him, he ſails towards *Ireland*, and landed on the 7th of " October, 1558, at *Dublin*. Then coming to the caſtle, the " lord FITZ-WALTERS, being lord-deputy, ſent for him to " come before him and the privy-council: who, coming in, " after he had made a ſpeech relating upon what account he " came over, he preſents the box unto the lord deputy, who, " cauſing it to be opened, that the ſecretary might read the " com-

and all the marks of unrelenting vengeance, the promoters of a pure and rational religion, and deprived BROWN and other proteſtant biſhops of their dignities in the church. But the reign of ELIZABETH gave a new and a deadly blow to popery, which was again recovering its force, and arming itſelf anew with the authority of the throne; and the Iriſh were obliged again to ſubmit to the form of worſhip and diſcipline eſtabliſhed in *England* [n].

The Reformation takes place in the United Provinces.

XII. The Reformation had not been long eſtabliſhed in *Britain*, when the Belgic provinces, united by a reſpectable confederacy, which ſtill ſubſiſts, withdrew from their ſpiritual allegiance to the Roman pontif. PHILIP II., king of *Spain*, apprehending the danger to which the religion of *Rome* was expoſed from that ſpirit of liberty and independence which reigned in the inhabitants of the *Low-Countries*, took the moſt violent meaſures to diſpel it. For this purpoſe he augmented the number of the biſhops, enacted the moſt ſevere

---

" commiſſion, there was nothing ſave a pack of cards with the " knave of clubs uppermoſt; which not only ſtartled the lord-" deputy and council, but the doctor, who aſſured them he had " a commiſſion, but knew not how it was gone; then the lord-" deputy made anſwer, *Let us have another commiſſion, and we* " *will ſhuffle the cards in the mean while.* The doctor, being " troubled in his mind, went away, and returned into *England*; " and, coming to the court, obtained another commiſſion; " but, ſtaying for a wind on the water ſide, news came to him " that the queen was dead; and thus God preſerved the pro-" teſtants of *Ireland*.".

Queen ELIZABETH was ſo delighted with this ſtory, which was related to her by Lord FITZ WALTER on his return to *England*, that ſhe ſent for ELIZABETH EDMONDS, whoſe huſband's name was MATTERSHAD, and gave her a penſion of forty pounds during her life. See COX, *Hibernia Anglicana*, or *Hiſtory of Ireland*, &c. vol. ii. p. 308.—*Harleian Miſcellany*, vol. v. p. 568.

[n] See *The Life of Dr.* GEORGE BROWN, *Archbiſhop of Dublin*, publiſhed at *London* in 4to, in the year 1681, and which has been reprinted in the fifth volume of the *Harleian Miſcellany*. No. LXXIX.

and barbarous laws againſt all innovators in matters of religion, and erected that unjuſt and inhuman tribunal of the *inquiſition*, which would intimidate and tame, as he thought, the manly ſpirit of an oppreſſed and perſecuted people. But his meaſures, in this reſpect, were as unſucceſsful as they were abſurd; his furious and intemperate zeal for the ſuperſtitions of *Rome* accelerated their deſtruction, and the papal authority, which had only been in a critical ſtate, was reduced to a deſperate one, by the very ſteps that were deſigned to ſupport it. The nobility formed themſelves into an *aſſociation*, in the year 1566, with a view to procure the repeal of theſe tyrannical and barbarous edicts; but, their ſolicitations and requeſts being treated with contempt, they reſolved to obtain by force, what they hoped to have gained from clemency and juſtice. They addreſſed themſelves to a free and an abuſed people, ſpurned the authority of a cruel yoke, and with an impetuoſity and vehemence that were perhaps exceſſive, trampled upon whatever was held ſacred or reſpectable by the church of *Rome* [o]. To quell theſe

---

☞ [o] Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems here to diſtinguiſh too little between the ſpirit of the nobility and that of the multitude. Nothing was more *temperate* and *decent* than the conduct of the former; and nothing could be more *tumultuous* and *irregular* than the behaviour of the latter. While the multitude deſtroyed churches, pulled down monaſteries, broke the images uſed in public worſhip, abuſed the officers of the inquiſition, and committed a thouſand enormities, the effects of furious reſentment and brutiſh rage; the nobility and more opulent citizens kept within the bounds of moderation and prudence. Though juſtly exaſperated againſt a deſpotic and cruel government, they dreaded the conſequences of popular tumults as the greateſt of misfortunes. Nay, many of them united their councils and forces with thoſe of the governeſs (the ducheſs of *Parma*) to reſtrain the ſeditious and turbulent ſpirit of the people. The prince of *Orange* and count *Egmont* (whoſe memories will live for ever in the grateful remembrance of the Dutch nation, and be dear to all the lovers of heroic patriotiſm and theſe tumults, a powerful army was ſent from *Spain*, under the command of the duke of ALVA, whoſe horrid barbarity and ſanguinary proceedings kindled that long and bloody war from which the powerful republic of the United Provinces derive its origin, conſiſtence, and grandeur. It was the heroic conduct of WILLIAM of *Naſſau*, prince of *Orange*, ſeconded by the ſuccours of *England* and *France*, that delivered this ſtate from the Spaniſh yoke. And no ſooner was this deliverance obtained, than the reformed religion, as it was profeſſed in *Switzerland*, was eſtabliſhed in the United Provinces [p]; and, at the ſame time, an univerſal toleration granted to thoſe whoſe religious ſentiments were of a different nature, whether they retained the faith of *Rome*, or embraced the Reformation in another form [q], provided ſtill that they made no attempts againſt the authority of the government, or the tranquillity of the public [r].

XIII. The

---

and ſacred liberty throughout the world) ſignalized their moderation upon this occaſion, and were the chief inſtruments of the repoſe that enſued. Their oppoſition to the government proceeded from the dictates of humanity and juſtice, and not from a ſpirit of licentiouſneſs and rebellion; and ſuch was their influence and authority among the people, that, had the imperious court of *Spain* condeſcended to make any reaſonable conceſſions, the public tranquillity might have been again reſtored, and the affections of the people entirely regained. See LE CLERC, *Hiſtoire des Prov. Un.* livr. i. p. 18.

[p] In the year 1573.

☞ [q] It is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh between the toleration that was granted to the Roman catholics, and that which the *Anabaptiſts, Lutherans*, and other proteſtant ſects, enjoyed. They were all indiſcriminately excluded from the civil employments of the ſtate; but though they were equally allowed the exerciſe of their religion, the latter were permitted to enjoy their religious worſhip in a more open and public manner than the former, from whom the churches were taken, and whoſe religious aſſemblies were confined to private conventicles, which had no external reſemblance of the edifices uſually ſet apart for divine worſhip.

[r] See a farther account of this matter in GERARD BRANDT's *Hiſtory of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, of which

The progreſs of the Reformation in *Spain* and *Italy*.

XIII. The Reformation made a conſiderable progreſs in *Spain* and *Italy* ſoon after the rupture between LUTHER and the Roman pontif. In all the provinces of *Italy*, but more eſpecially in the territories of *Venice*, *Tuſcany*, and *Naples*, the religion of *Rome* loſt ground, and great numbers of perſons, of all ranks and orders, expreſſed an averſion to the papal yoke. This gave riſe to violent and dangerous commotions in the kingdom of *Naples* in the year 1546, of which the principal authors were BERNARD OCHINO and PETER MARTYR, who, in their public diſcourſes from the pulpit, exhauſted all the force of their irreſiſtible eloquence in expoſing the enormity of the reigning ſuperſtition. Theſe tumults were appeaſed with much difficulty by the united efforts of CHARLES V., and his viceroy DON PEDRO DI TOLEDO [*s*]. In ſeveral places the popes put a ſtop to the progreſs of the Reformation, by letting looſe, upon the pretended heretics, their bloody *inquiſitors*, who ſpread the marks of their uſual barbarity through the greateſt part of *Italy*. Theſe formidable miniſters of ſuperſtition put ſo many to death, and perpetrated, on the friends of religious liberty, ſuch horrid acts of cruelty and oppreſſion, that moſt of the reformiſts conſulted their ſafety by a voluntary exile, while others returned to the religion of *Rome*, at leaſt in external appearance. But the terrors of the *inquiſition*, which frightened back into the profeſſion of popery ſeveral proteſtants in other parts of *Italy*, could not penetrate into the kingdom of *Naples*, nor could either the authority or entreaties of the

---

which there was a French abridgment publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, in three volumes 12mo, in the year 1730. The original work was publiſhed in Dutch, in four volumes 4to.

[*s*] See GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 108.—Vita GALEACII *in Muſeo Helvetico*, tom. ii. p. 524.

Roman pontifs engage the Neapolitans to admit within their territories either a court of inquiſition, or even viſiting inquiſitors [t].

The eyes of ſeveral perſons in *Spain* were opened upon the truth, not only by the ſpirit of inquiry, which the controverſies between LUTHER and

---

☞ [t] It was an attempt to introduce a Roman inquiſitor into the city of *Naples*, that, properly ſpeaking, produced the tumult and ſedition which Dr. MOSHEIM attributes in this ſection to the pulpit-diſcourſes of OCHINO and MARTYR; for theſe famous preachers, and particularly the former, taught the doctrines of the Reformation with great art, prudence, and caution, and converted many ſecretly, without giving public offence. The emperor himſelf, who heard him at *Naples*, declared, that *he preached with ſuch ſpirit and devotion as was ſufficient to make the very ſtones weep.* After OCHINO's departure from *Naples*, the diſciples he had formed gave private inſtructions to others, among whom were ſome eminent eccleſiaſtics and perſons of diſtinction, who began to form congregations and conventicles. This awakened the jealouſy of the viceroy TOLEDO, who publiſhed a ſevere edict againſt heretical books, ordered ſome productions of MELANCTHON and ERASMUS to be publicly burnt, looked with a ſuſpicious eye on all kinds of literature, ſuppreſſed ſeveral academies, which had been erected about this time by the nobility for the advancement of learning; and, having received orders from the emperor to introduce the inquiſition, deſired pope PAUL III. to ſend from *Rome* to *Naples* a deputy of that formidable tribunal. It was this that excited the people to take up arms in order to defend themſelves againſt this branch of ſpiritual tyranny, which the Neapolitans never were patient enough to ſuffer, and which, on many occaſions, they had oppoſed with vigour and ſucceſs. Hoſtilities enſued, which were followed by an accommodation of matters and a general pardon; while the emperor and viceroy, by this reſolute oppoſition, were deterred from their deſign of introducing this deſpotic tribunal into the kingdom of *Naples*. Several other attempts were afterwards made, during the reign of PHILIP II., III., IV., and CHARLES II., to eſtabliſh the inquiſition in *Naples*; but, by the jealouſy and vigilance of the people, they all proved ineffectual. At length the emperor CHARLES VI., in the beginning of this preſent century, publiſhed an edict, expreſsly prohibiting all cauſes, relating to the holy faith, to be tried by any perſons, except the archbiſhops and biſhops as ordinaries. See GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, livr. xxxii. ſect. 2 and 3.—*Modern Univ. Hiſtory*, vol. xxviii. p. 273, &c. edit. octavo.

Rome had excited in *Europe*, but even by thoſe very divines, which CHARLES V. had brought with him into *Germany*, to combat the pretended *hereſy* of the reformers. For theſe Spaniſh doctors imbibed this hereſy inſtead of refuting it, and propagated it more or leſs, on their return home, as appears evidently from ſeveral circumſtances [*u*]. But the *inquiſition*, which could not gain any footing in the kingdom of *Naples*, reigned triumphant in *Spain*; and by racks, gibbets, ſtakes, and other ſuch formidable inſtruments of its method of perſuading, ſoon terrified the people back into popery, and ſuppreſſed the vehement deſire they had of changing a ſuperſtitious worſhip for a rational religion [*w*].

What judgment we are to form concerning the Reformation, and the means by which it was produced.

XIV. I ſhall not pretend to diſpute with thoſe writers, whatever their ſecret intentions may be, who obſerve, that many unjuſtifiable proceedings may be charged upon ſome of the moſt eminent promoters of this great change in the ſtate of religion. For every impartial and attentive obſerver of the riſe and progreſs of the Reformation will ingenuouſly

---

☞ [*u*] This appears from the unhappy end of all the eccleſiaſtics that had attended CHARLES V. and followed him into his retirement. No ſooner was the breath of that monarch out, than they were put into the inquiſition, and were afterwards committed to the flames, or ſent to death in other forms equally terrible. Such was the fate of AUGUSTIN CASAL, the emperor's preacher; of CONSTANTINE PONTIUS, his confeſſor; of the learned EGIDIUS, whom he had nominated to the biſhopric of *Tortoſa*; of BARTHOLOMEW DE CARANZA, a Dominican, who had been confeſſor to king PHILIP and queen MARY, with above twenty more of leſs note. All this gave reaſon to preſume that CHARLES V. died a proteſtant. Certain it is, that he knew well the corruptions and frauds of the church of *Rome*, and the grounds and reaſons of the proteſtant faith; though buſineſs, ambition, intereſt, and the prejudices of education, may have blinded him for a while, until leiſure, retirement, the abſence of worldly temptations, and the approach of death, removed the veil, and led him to wiſe and ſerious reflexions. See BURNET's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, and the book cited in the following note.

[*w*] See GEDDES, his *Spaniſh Martyrology*, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, tom. i. p. 445.

ingenuouſly acknowledge, that wiſdom and prudence did not always attend the tranſactions of thoſe that were concerned in this glorious cauſe; that many things were done with violence, temerity, and precipitation; and, what is ſtill worſe, that ſeveral of the principal agents in this great revolution were actuated more by the impulſe of paſſions, and views of intereſt, than by a zeal for the advancement of true religion. But, on the other hand, the wiſe and candid obſerver of things will own, as a moſt evident and inconteſtable truth, that many things which, when ſtripped of the circumſtances and motives that attended them, appear to us at this time as real crimes, will be deprived of their enormity, and even acquire the aſpect of noble deeds, if they be conſidered in one point of view with the times and places in which they were tranſacted, and with the frauds and crimes of the Roman pontifs and their creatures, by which they were occaſioned. But after all, in defending the cauſe of the Reformation, we are under no obligation to defend, in all things, the moral characters of its promoters and inſtruments. Theſe two objects are entirely diſtinct. The moſt juſt and excellent cauſe may be promoted with low views and from ſiniſter motives, without loſing its nature, or ceaſing to be juſt and excellent. The true ſtate of the queſtion here, is, whether the oppoſition made, by LUTHER and the other reformers, to the Roman pontif, was founded on juſt and ſolid reaſons? and this queſtion is entirely independent of the virtues or vices of particular perſons [x]. Let many of theſe perſons be ſuppoſed as odious, nay, ſtill more deteſtable, than they are pleaſed to repreſent them, provided the cauſe in which they were embarked be allowed to have been juſt and good.

☞ [x] The tranſlator has added here ſome paragraphs, to render more palpable the important obſervation of the learned author.

APPENDIX I.

Concerning the SPIRIT *and* CONDUCT *of the firſt Reformers, and the charge of* ENTHUSIASM *(i. e.* fanaticiſm), *that has been brought againſt them by a celebrated Author.*

THE candour and impartiality, with which Dr. MOSHEIM repreſents the tranſactions of thoſe who were agents and inſtruments in bringing about the Reformation, are highly laudable. He acknowledges, that imprudence, paſſion, and even a low ſelf-intereſt, mingled ſometimes their raſh proceedings and ignoble motives in this excellent cauſe; and, in the very nature of things, it could not be otherwiſe. It is one of the moſt inevitable conſequences of the ſubordination and connexions of civil ſociety, that many improper inſtruments and agents are ſet to work in all great and important revolutions, whether of a religious or political nature. When great men appear in theſe revolutions, they draw after them their dependants; and the unhappy effects of a party-ſpirit are unavoidably diſplayed in the beſt cauſe. The ſubjects follow their prince; the multitude adopt the ſyſtem of their leaders, without entering into its true ſpirit, or being judiciouſly attentive to the proper methods of promoting it; and thus irregular proceedings are employed in the maintenance of the truth. Thus it happened in the important revolution that delivered a great part of *Europe* from the ignominious yoke of the Roman pontif. The ſovereigns, the eccleſiaſtics, the men of weight, piety, learning, who aroſe to aſſert the rights of human nature, the cauſe of genuine Chriſtianity, and the exerciſe of religious liberty, came forth into the field of controverſy with a multitude of dependants, admirers, and friends, whoſe motives and conduct cannot be entirely juſtified. Beſides, when the eyes of whole nations were opened upon the iniquitous abſurdities of popery, and upon the tyranny and inſolence of the Roman pontifs, it was ſcarcely poſſible to ſet bounds to the indignation of an incenſed and tumultuous multitude, who are naturally prone to extremes, generally paſs from blind ſubmiſſion to lawleſs ferocity, and too rarely diſtinguiſh between the uſe and abuſe of their undoubted rights. In a word, many things, which appear to us extremely irregular in the conduct and meaſures of *ſome* of the inſtruments of our happy reformation, will be entitled to a certain degree of indulgence, if the ſpirit of the times, the ſituation of the contending parties, the barbarous provocations of popery, and the infirmities of human nature, be duly and attentively conſidered.

The queſtion here is, what was the *ſpirit* which animated the *firſt* and *principal reformers*, who aroſe in times of darkneſs and deſpair to deliver oppreſſed kingdoms from the dominion of *Rome*, and upon what principles a LUTHER, a ZUINGLE, a CALVIN, a MELANCTHON, a BUCER, &c. embarked in the arduous cauſe of the Reformation? This queſtion, indeed, is not at all neceſſary to the defence of the Reformation, which reſts upon the ſtrong foundations of ſcripture and reaſon, and whoſe excellence is abſolutely independent on the virtues of thoſe who took the lead in promoting it. Bad men may be, and often are, embarked in the beſt cauſes; as ſuch cauſes afford the moſt ſpecious maſk to cover mercenary views, or to diſguiſe ambitious purpoſes. But, until the more than Jeſuitical and diſingenuous PHILIPS reſumed the trumpet of calumny [a], even the voice of popery had ceaſed to attack the moral characters of the leading reformers.

Theſe eminent men were, indeed, attacked from another quarter, and by a much more reſpectable writer. The truly ingenious Mr. HUME, ſo juſtly celebrated as one of the firſt favourites of the hiſtorical Muſe, has, in his Hiſtory of *England*, and more eſpecially in the Hiſtory of the houſes of TUDOR and STUART, repreſented the character and temper of the *firſt reformers* in a point of view, which undoubtedly ſhews, that he had not conſidered them with that cloſe and impartial attention that ought always to precede perſonal reflexions. He has laid it down as a principle, that SUPERSTITION and ENTHUSIASM are *two ſpecies of religion* that ſtand in *diametrical oppoſition* to each other; and ſeems to eſtabliſh it as a fact, that the *former* is the genius of popery, and the *latter* the characteriſtic of the Reformation. Both the *principle* and its *application* muſt appear extremely ſingular; and three ſorts of perſons muſt be more eſpecially ſurpriſed at it.

Firſt, Perſons of a philoſophical turn, who are accuſtomed to ſtudy human nature, and to deſcribe with preciſion both its regular and excentric movements, muſt be ſurpriſed to ſee *ſuperſtition* and *fanaticiſm* [b] repreſented as oppoſite and jarring qualities. They have been ſeen often together, holding with each other a moſt friendly correſpondence; and, indeed, if we conſider their nature and their eſſential characters, their union will appear not only poſſible, but in ſome caſes natural, if not neceſſary. *Superſtition*, which conſiſts in *falſe* and *abject* notions of the Deity, in the gloomy and groundleſs *fears* of inviſible beings, and in the abſurd rites, that theſe notions and theſe fears naturally produce, is certainly at the root of various branches of fanaticiſm. For what is *fanaticiſm*, but the viſions, illuminations, impulſes, and dreams of an over-heated fancy, converted into rules of faith, hope, worſhip, and practice? This fanaticiſm, as it ſprings up in a melancholy or a cheerful complexion, aſſumes a variety of aſpects, and its moroſe and gloomy forms are certainly moſt congenial with ſuperſtition, in its proper ſenſe. It was probably this conſideration that led the author of the article *Fanaticiſm*, in the famous *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique*, publiſhed at *Paris*, to define it [c] as *a blind and paſſionate zeal, which ariſeth from* SUPERSTITIOUS *opinions; and leads its votaries to commit ridiculous, unjuſt, and cruel actions, not only without ſhame, but even with certain internal feelings of joy and comfort*; from which the author concludes, that FANATICISM *is really nothing more than* SUPERSTITION *ſet in motion.* This definition unites perhaps too cloſely theſe two kinds of *falſe* religion, whoſe enormities have furniſhed very ill-grounded pretexts for diſcrediting and miſrepreſenting the *true.* It is however a teſtimony, from one of the pretended oracles of modern philoſophy, in favour of the compatibility of *fanaticiſm* with *ſuperſtition.* Theſe two principles are evidently diſtinct; becauſe *ſuperſtition* is, generally ſpeaking, the effect of ignorance, or of a judgment perverted by a ſour and ſplenetic temper; whereas *fanaticiſm* is the offspring of an inflamed *imagination*, and may exiſt where there is no ſuperſtition, *i. e.* no falſe or gloomy notions of the Divinity. But though diſtinct, they are not oppoſite principles; on the contrary, they lend, on many occaſions, mutual ſtrength and aſſiſtance to each other.

---

[a] See the various anſwers that were made to this biographer by the ingenious Mr. PYE, the learned Dr. NEVE, and other commendable writers, who have appeared in this controverſy.

[b] I uſe the word *fanaticiſm* here inſtead of *enthuſiaſm*, to prevent all ambiguity; becauſe, as ſhall be ſhewn preſently, Mr. HUME takes *enthuſiaſm*, in its worſt ſenſe, when he applies it to the reformers; and in that ſenſe it is not only equivalent to, but is perfectly ſynonymous with, ſanaticiſm. Beſides, this latter term is uſed indiſcriminately with enthuſiaſm, by this celebrated hiſtorian, in characteriſing the Reformation.

---

[c] The words of the original are: *Le fanatiſme eſt un zele aveugle et paſſionné, qui nait des opinions ſuperſtitieuſes, et fait commettre des actions ridicules, injuſtes et cruelles, non ſeulement ſans honte, mais avec une ſorte de joye et de conſolation. Le fanatiſme donc n'eſt que la ſuperſtition miſe en mouvement.*

If perſons accuſtomed to philoſophical preciſion will not reliſh the maxim of the celebrated writer which I have been now conſidering, ſo neither, in the *ſecond place*, can thoſe who are verſed in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory look upon *ſuperſtition* as a more predominant characteriſtic of popery than *fanaticiſm*; and yet this is a leading idea, which is not only viſible in many parts of this author's excellent Hiſtory, but appears to be the baſis of all the reflexions he employs, and of all the epithets he uſes, in his ſpeculations upon the Romiſh religion.

And nevertheleſs it is manifeſt, that the multitudes of fanatics, which aroſe in the church of *Rome* before the Reformation, are truly innumerable; and the operations of fanaticiſm in that church were, at leaſt, as viſible and frequent, as the reſtleſs workings of ſuperſtition; they went, in ſhort, hand in hand, and united their viſions and their terrors in the ſupport of the papacy. It is, more eſpecially, well known, that the greateſt part of the monaſtic eſtabliſhments (that alternately inſulted the benignity of Providence by their auſterities, and abuſed it by their licentious luxury), were originally founded in conſequence of pretended illuminations, miraculous dreams, and ſuch like wild deluſions of an overheated fancy. Whenever a new doctrine was to be eſtabliſhed, that could augment the authority of the pope, or fill the coffers of the clergy; whenever a new convent was to be erected, there was always a viſion or a miracle ready to facilitate the buſineſs; nor muſt it be imagined, that forgery and impoſture were the only agents in this matter;—by no means;—impoſture there was; and it was frequently employed; but impoſtures made uſe of fanatics; and in return fanatics found impoſtors, who ſpread abroad their fame, and turned their viſions to profit. Were I to recount with the utmoſt ſimplicity, without the ſmalleſt addition of ludicrous embelliſhment, the extaſies, viſions, ſeraphic amours, celeſtial apparitions, that are ſaid to have ſhed ſuch an odour of ſanctity upon the male and female ſaints of the Romiſh church; were I to paſs in review the famous *conformities* of St. FRANCIS, the illuminations of St. IGNATIUS, and the enormous cloud of fanatical witneſſes that have diſhonoured humanity in bearing teſtimony to popery, this diſſertation would become a voluminous hiſtory. Let the reader caſt an eye upon Dr. MOSHEIM's account of thoſe ages that more immediately preceded the Reformation, and he will ſee what a number of ſects, *purely fanatical*, aroſe in the boſom of the Romiſh church.

But this is not all—for it muſt be carefully obſerved, that even thoſe extravagant fanatics, who produced ſuch diſorders in *Germany* about the commencement of the Reformation, were nurſed in the boſom of popery, were profeſſed papiſts before they adopted the cauſe of LUTHER, nay, many of them paſſed directly from popery to fanaticiſm, without even entering into the outward profeſſion of Lutheraniſm. It is alſo to be obſerved, that beſides the fanatics, who expoſed themſelves to the contempt of the wiſe upon the public theatre of popery, SECKENDORF ſpeaks of a ſect that merits of this denomination, which had ſpread in the *Netherlands*, before LUTHER raiſed his voice againſt popery, and whoſe members were engaged, by the terror of penal laws, to diſſemble their ſentiments; nay, even affected a devout compliance with the external rites of the eſtabliſhed worſhip, until religious liberty, introduced by the reformation, encouraged them to pull off the maſk, and propagate their opinions, ſeveral of which were licentious and profane.

But, in the *third place*, the friends of the Reformation muſt naturally be both ſurpriſed and diſpleaſed to find *enthuſiaſm*, or *fanaticiſm*, laid down by Mr. HUME as the character and ſpirit of its founders and abettors, without any exception, or diſtinction, made in favour of any one of the reformers. That *fanaticiſm* was viſible in the conduct and ſpirit of many who embraced the Reformation, is a fact which I do not pretend to deny; and it may be worthy of the reader's curioſity to conſider, for a moment, how this came to paſs. That religious liberty, which the Reformation introduced and granted (in conſequence of its eſſential principles) indiſcriminately to all, to learned and unlearned, rendered this eruption of enthuſiaſm inevitable. It is one of the imperfections annexed to all human things, that our beſt bleſſings have their inconveniencies, or, at leaſt, are ſuſceptible of abuſe. As liberty is a *natural right*, but not a *diſcerning principle*, it could not open the door to truth without letting error and deluſion come in along with it. If *reaſon* came forth with dignity, when delivered from the deſpotiſm of authority, and the blind ſervitude of implicit faith; *imagination*, alſo ſet free, and leſs able to bear the proſperous change, came forth likewiſe, but with a different aſpect, and expoſed to view the reveries it had been long obliged to conceal.

Thus many fanatical phantoms were exhibited, which neither aroſe from the ſpirit of the Reformation, nor from the principles of the reformers, but which had been engendered in the boſom of popery, and which the foſtering rays of liberty had diſcloſed; ſimilar in this, to the enlivening beams of the ſun, which fructifies *indiſcriminately* the *ſalutary plant* in the well-cultivated ground, and the *noxious weed* in a rank and neglected ſoil. And as the Reformation had no ſuch miraculous influence (not to ſpeak of the imperfection that attended its infancy, and that has not entirely been removed from its more advanced ſtages) as to cure human nature of its infirmities and follies, to convert irregular paſſions into regular principles, or to turn men into angels before the time, it has ſtill left the field open, both for fanaticiſm and ſuperſtition to ſow their *tares* among the *good ſeed*; and this will probably be the caſe until the *end of the world.* It is here, that we muſt ſeek for the true cauſe of all that condemnable enthuſiaſm that has diſhonoured the chriſtian name, and often troubled the order of civil ſociety, at different periods of time ſince the Reformation; and for which the Reformation is no more reſponſible, than a free government is for the weakneſs or corruption of thoſe who abuſe its lenity and indulgence. The Reformation eſtabliſhed the ſacred and unalienable right of private judgment; but it could not hinder the private judgment of many from being wild and extravagant.

The Reformation, then, which the multiplied enormities of popery rendered ſo neceſſary, muſt be always diſtinguiſhed from the abuſes that might be, and were often made, of the liberty it introduced. If you aſk, indeed, what was the *temper* and *ſpirit* of the *firſt* heralds of this happy Reformation, Mr. HUME will tell you, *that they* were *univerſally* inflamed with the higheſt *enthuſiaſm.* This aſſertion, if taken ſingly, and not compared with other paſſages relating to the reformers, might be underſtood in a ſenſe conſiſtent with truth, nay, even honourable to the character of theſe eminent men. For, if by *enthuſiaſm* we underſtand that ſpirit of ardor, intrepidity, and generous zeal, which leads men to brave the moſt formidable obſtacles and dangers in defence of a cauſe, whoſe excellence and importance have made a deep impreſſion upon their minds; the firſt reformers will be allowed by their warmeſt friends to have been enthuſiaſts. This ſpecies of *enthuſiaſm* is a noble affection, when fitly placed and wiſely exerted. It is this generous ſenſibility, this ardent feeling of the *great* and the *excellent*, that forms heroes and patriots; and without it, nothing difficult and arduous, that is attended with danger or prejudice to our temporal intereſts, can either be attempted with vigour, or executed with ſucceſs. Nay, had this ingenious writer obſerved, that the ardor of the firſt reformers was more or leſs violent, that it was more or leſs blended with the warmth and vivacity of human paſſions, candour would be obliged to avow the charge.

But it is not in any of theſe points of view, that our eminent hiſtorian conſiders the ſpirit, temper, and enthuſiaſm of the firſt reformers. The enthuſiaſm he attributes to them is fanaticiſm in its worſt ſenſe. He ſpeaks indeed of the *inflexible intrepidity, with which they braved dangers, torments, and even death itſelf*; but he calls them *the fanatical and enraged reformers:* he indicates, through the whole courſe of his hiſtory, fanaticiſm as the characteriſtic of the proteſtant religion and its glorious founders; the terms *proteſtant fanaticiſm*—*fanatical churches* are interſperſed in various parts of this work; and we never meet with the leaſt appearance of a diſtinction between the *rational* and *enthuſiaſtic*, the *wiſe* and *indiſcreet* friends of the Reformation. In ſhort, we find a phraſeology conſtantly employed upon this ſubject, which diſcovers an intention to confound proteſtantiſm with enthuſiaſm, and to make reformers and fanatics ſynonymous terms. We are told, that while abſurd rites and burthenſome ſuperſtitions reigned in the Romiſh church, the reformers were *thrown, by a ſpirit of oppoſition, into an enthuſiaſtic ſtrain of devotion*; and in another place, that theſe latter *placed all merit in a myſterious ſpecies of faith, in* INWARD VISION, RAPTURE *and* EXTACY. It would be endleſs to quote the paſſages in which this repreſentation of things is repeated in a great variety of phraſes, and artfully inſinuated into the mind of the reader, by dextrous ſtrokes of a ſeducing pencil; which, though ſcattered here and there, yet gradually unite their influence on the imagination of an uninſtructed and unwary reader, and form, imperceptibly, an unfavourable impreſſion of that great event, to which we owe at this day our civil and religious liberty, and our deliverance from a yoke of ſuperſtitious and barbarous deſpotiſm. Proteſtants, in all ages and places, are ſtigmatized by Mr. HUME with very diſhonourable titles; and it ſtruck me particularly to ſee even the generous oppoſers of the Spaniſh inquiſition in *Holland*, whoſe proceedings were ſo moderate, and whoſe complaints were ſo humble, until the barbarous yoke of ſuperſtition and tyranny became intolerable; it ſtruck me, I ſay, to ſee theſe generous patriots branded with the general character of *bigots*. This is certainly a ſevere appellation; and were it applied with much more equity than it is, I think it would ſtill come with an ill grace from a lover of freedom, from a man who lives and writes with ſecurity under the auſpicious ſhade of that very liberty which the Reformation introduced, and for which the Belgic heroes (or *bigots*—if we muſt call them ſo) ſhed their blood. I obſerve with pain, that the phraſeology employed perpetually by Mr. HUME, on ſimilar occaſions, ſeems to diſcover a keen diſlike of every oppoſition made to power in favour of the Reformation. Nay, upon the too general principle which this eminent writer has diffuſed through his hiſtory, we ſhall be obliged to brand with the opprobrious mark of fanaticiſm, thoſe generous friends of civil and religious liberty, who, in the Revolution in 1688, oppoſed the meaſures of a popiſh prince and an arbitrary government; and to rank the BURNETS, TILLOTSONS, STILLINGFLEETS, and other *immortal* ornaments of the proteſtant name, among the enthuſiaſtic tribe; it is a queſtion, whether even a BOYLE, a NEWTON, or a LOCKE, will eſcape a cenſure, which is laviſhed without mercy and without diſtinction.—But my preſent buſineſs is with the *firſt reformers*, and to them I return.

Thoſe who more eſpecially merit that title were LUTHER, ZUINGLE, CALVIN, MELANCTHON, BUCER, MARTYR, BULLINGER, BEZA, OECOLAMPADIUS, and others. Now theſe were *all* men of learning, who came forth into the field of controverſy (in which the fate of future ages, with reſpect to liberty, was to be decided) with a kind of arms that did not at all give them the aſpect of perſons agitated by the impulſe, or ſeduced by the deluſions, of fanaticiſm. They pretended not to be called to the work they undertook by viſions, or internal illuminations and impulſes;—they never attempted to work miracles, nor pleaded a Divine commiſſion;—they taught no new religion, nor laid claim to any extraordinary vocation;—they reſpected government, practiſed and taught ſubmiſſion to civil rulers, and deſired only the liberty of that conſcience which God has made free, and which ceaſes to be conſcience if it be not free. They maintained, that the faith of Chriſtians was to be determined by the word of God alone;—

they had recourſe to reaſon and argument, to the rules of ſound criticiſm, and to the authority and light of hiſtory.—They tranſlated the ſcriptures into the popular languages of different countries, and appealed to them as the only teſt of religious truth. They exhorted Chriſtians to judge for themſelves, to ſearch the ſcriptures, to break aſunder the bonds of ignorant prejudice and lawleſs authority, and to aſſert that liberty of conſcience to which they had an unalienable right as reaſonable beings. Mr. HUME himſelf acknowledges, that they offered to ſubmit *all religious doctrines to private judgment, and exhorted every one to examine the principles formerly impoſed upon him.* In ſhort, it was their great and avowed purpoſe to oppoſe the groſs corruptions and the ſpiritual tyranny of *Rome* [d], of which Mr. HUME himſelf complains with a juſt indignation, and which he cenſures in as keen and vehement terms, as thoſe which were uſed by LUTHER and CALVIN in their warmeſt moments.

I have already inſinuated, and I acknowledge it here again, that the zeal of the reformers was ſometimes intemperate; but I cannot think this circumſtance ſufficient to juſtify the aſperſion of *Fanaticiſm*, which is caſt both on the ſpirit of the Reformation, and the principal agents concerned in it. A man may be over-zealous in the advancement of, what he ſuppoſes to be, the true religion, without being entitled to the denomination of a *fanatic*; unleſs we depart from the uſual ſenſe of this word, which is often enough employed to have acquired, before this time, a determinate ſignification. The intemperate zeal

---

[d] See the ſenſible and judicious *Letters on Mr.* HUME's *Hiſtory of Great Britain* (ſuch is the title), that were publiſhed at *Edinburgh* in the year 1756; and in which ſome points, which I have barely mentioned here, are enlarged upon, and illuſtrated, in an ample and ſatisfactory manner.

of the reformers was the reſult of that ardour, which takes place in all diviſions and parties that are founded upon objects of real or ſuppoſed importance; and it may be affirmed, that, in ſuch circumſtances, the moſt generous minds, filled with a perſuaſion of the goodneſs of their end and of the uprightneſs of their intentions, are the moſt liable to tranſgreſs the exact bounds of moderation, and to adopt meaſures, which, in the calm hour of deliberate reflexion, they themſelves would not approve. In all great diviſions, the warmth of natural temper,—the provocation of unjuſt and violent oppoſition,—a ſpirit of ſympathy, which connects, in ſome caſes, the moſt diſſimilar characters, renders the mild violent, and the phlegmatic warm —nay, frequently the pride of conqueſt, which mingles itſelf, imperceptibly, with the beſt principles and the moſt generous views, all theſe produce or nouriſh an intemperate zeal; and this zeal is, in ſome caſes, almoſt inevitable. On the other hand, it may be ſuſpected, that ſome writers, and Mr. HUME among others, may have given too high colours to their deſcriptions of this intemperate zeal. There is a paſſage of Sir ROBERT COTTON, that has much meaning, "moſt men " (*ſays he*) grew to be frozen in zeal and benummed, ſo that whoſoever pretended a little *ſpark* " *of earneſtneſs*, he ſeemed no leſs than red fire " hot, in compariſon of the other."

Nothing can be more foreign from my temper and ſentiments, than to plead the cauſe of an exceſſive zeal; more eſpecially, every kind of zeal that approaches to a ſpirit of intolerance and perſecution ought to be regarded with averſion and horror by all who have at heart the intereſt of genuine Chriſtianity, and the happineſs of civil ſociety. There may be, nevertheleſs, caſes, in which a zeal (not that breathes a ſpirit of perſecution, but) that mounts to a certain degree of intemperance,

temperance, may be not only inevitable, but uſeful; nay, not only *uſeful*, but *neceſſary*. This aſſertion I advance almoſt againſt my will—becauſe it is ſuſceptible of great and dangerous abuſe—the aſſertion however is true, though the caſes muſt be ſingularly important and deſperate to which ſuch zeal may be applied. It has been obſerved, that the Reformation was one of theſe caſes, and, all things attentively conſidered, the obſervation appears to be entirely juſt; and the violence of expreſſion and vehement meaſures employed by ſome of the reformers, *might have been* (I do not ſay that they *really were*) as much the effect of provident reflexion, as of natural fervour and reſentment. To a calculating head, which conſidered cloſely, in theſe times of corruption and darkneſs, the ſtrength of the court of *Rome*, the luxury and deſpotiſm of the pontifs, the ignorance and licentiouſneſs of the clergy, the ſuperſtition and ſtupidity of the people; in a word, the deep root which the papacy had gained through all theſe circumſtances combined, what was the firſt thought that muſt naturally have occurred? No doubt, the improbability that cool philoſophy, diſpaſſionate reaſon and affectionate remonſtrances would ever triumph over theſe multiplied and various ſupports of popery. And, if a calculating head muſt have judged in this manner, a generous heart, which conſidered the bleſſings that muſt ariſe upon mankind with religious liberty and a reformation of the church, would naturally be excited to apply even a violent remedy, if that were *neceſſary*, to remove ſuch a deſperate and horrible diſeaſe. It would really ſeem, that LUTHER acted on ſuch a view of things. He began mildly, and did not employ the fire of his zeal, before he ſaw that it was eſſential to the ſucceſs of his cauſe. Whoever looks into Dr. MOSHEIM's hiſtory, or any other impartial account of the XVIth century, will find, that LUTHER's oppoſition to the infamous traffic of indulgences, was carried on, at firſt, in the moſt ſubmiſſive ſtrain, by humble remonſtrances addreſſed to the pope, and the moſt eminent prelates of the church. Theſe remonſtrances were anſwered, not only by the deſpotic voice of authority, but alſo by opprobrious invectives, perfidious plots againſt his perſon, and the terror of penal laws. Even under theſe he maintained his tranquillity; and his conduct at the famous diet of *Worms*, though reſolute and ſteddy, was nevertheleſs both reſpectful and modeſt. But when all gentle meaſures proved ineffectual; then, indeed, he acted with redoubled vigour, and added a new degree of warmth and impetuoſity to his zeal; and (I repeat it) reflexion might have dictated thoſe animated proceedings, which were owing, perhaps, merely to his reſentment, and the natural warmth of his temper inflamed by oppoſition. Certain it is, at leaſt, that neither the elegant ſatires of ERASMUS (had he even been a friend to the cauſe of liberty), nor the timid remonſtrances of the gentle MELANCTHON (who was really ſuch), would ever have been ſufficient to bring about a reformation of the church. The former made many *laugh*, the latter made ſome *reaſon*; but neither of the two could make them *act*, or ſet them in motion. In ſuch a criſis, bold ſpeech and ardent reſolution were neceſſary to produce that happy change in the face of religion, which has crowned with ineſtimable bleſſings one part of *Europe*, and has been productive of many advantages even to the other, which cenſures it.

As to CALVIN, every one, who has any acquaintance with hiſtory, knows how he ſet out in promoting the Reformation. It was by a work compoſed with a claſſic elegance of ſtyle; and which, though tinctured with the ſcholaſtic theology of the times, breathes an uncommon ſpirit of good ſenſe and moderation. This work was the *Inſtitutes of the Chriſtian Religion*, in which the learned writer ſhews, that the doctrine of the reformers was founded in ſcripture and reaſon. Nay, one of the deſigns of this book was to ſhew, that the reformers ought not to be confounded with certain *fanatics*, who, about the time of the Reformation, ſprung from the boſom of the church of *Rome*, and excited tumults and commotions in ſeveral places. The French monarch (FRANCIS I.), to cover with a ſpecious pretext his barbarous perſecution of the friends of the Reformation, and to prevent the reſentment of the proteſtants in *Germany*, with whom it was his intereſt to be on good terms, alleged, that his ſeverity fell, *only*, upon a ſect of enthuſiaſts, who, under the title of *Anabaptiſts*, ſubſtituted their viſions in the place of the doctrines and declarations of the Holy Scriptures. To vindicate the Reformers from this reproach, CALVIN wrote the book now under conſideration; and though the theology that reigns in it be chargeable with ſome defects, yet it is as remote from the ſpirit and complexion of fanaticiſm, as any thing can be. Nor indeed is this ſpirit viſible in any of the writings of CALVIN that I have peruſed. His commentary upon the Old and New Teſtament is a production that will always be eſteemed, on account of its elegant ſimplicity, and the evident marks it bears of an unprejudiced and impartial inquiry into the plain ſenſe of the ſacred writings, and of ſagacity and penetration in the inveſtigation of it.

If we were to paſs in review the writings of the other eminent reformers, whoſe names have been already mentioned, we ſhould find abundant matter to juſtify them in the ſame reſpect. They were men of letters, nay, ſeveral of them men of taſte for the age in which they lived; they cultivated the ſtudy of languages, hiſtory, and criticiſm, and applied themſelves with indefatigable induſtry to theſe ſtudies, which, of all others, are the leaſt adapted to excite or nouriſh a ſpirit of *fanaticiſm.* They had, indeed, their errors and prejudices; nor perhaps were they few in number; but who is free from the ſame charge? We have ours too, though they may turn on a different ſet of objects. Their theology ſavoured ſomewhat of the pedantry and jargon of the ſchools;—how could it be otherwiſe, conſidering the diſmal ſtate of philoſophy at that period? The advantages we enjoy above them, give them, at leaſt, a title to our candour and indulgence; perhaps to our gratitude, as the inſtruments who prepared the way through which theſe advantages have been conveyed to us. To conclude, let us regret their infirmities; let us reject their errors; let us even condemn any inſtances of ill-judged ſeverity and violence they may have been chargeable with;—but let us never forget, that, through perils and obſtacles almoſt unſurmountable, they open the path to that religious liberty, which we cannot too highly eſteem, nor be too careful to improve to rational and worthy purpoſes.

SECTION II.

The GENERAL HISTORY *of the* CHURCH.

The borders of the church enlarged.

I. THE Spaniards and Portugueſe, if we may give credit to their hiſtorians, exerted themſelves, with the greateſt vigour and ſucceſs, in the propagation of the goſpel among the darkened nations [a]. And it muſt, indeed, be confeſſed, that they communicated ſome notions, ſuch as they were, of the Chriſtian religion to the inhabitants of *America*, to thoſe parts of *Africa* where they carried their arms, and to the iſlands and maritime provinces of *Aſia*, which they reduced under their dominion. It is alſo true, that conſiderable numbers of theſe ſavage people, who had hitherto lived, either under the bondage of the moſt extravagant ſuperſtitions, or in a total ignorance of any object of religious worſhip, embraced, at leaſt in outward appearance, the doctrines of the Goſpel. But when we conſider the methods of converſion that were employed by the Spaniſh miſſionaries among theſe wretched nations, the barbarous laws and inhuman tortures that were uſed to force them into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity; when it is conſidered, farther, that the denomination of Chriſtians was conferred upon ſuch of thoſe poor wretches as diſcovered a blind and exceſſive veneration for their ſtupid inſtructors, and were able, by certain geſtures, and the repetition of a little jargon, to perform a few ſuperſtitious rites and ceremonies; then, inſtead of rejoicing at, we ſhall be tempted to lament, ſuch a propagation of the goſpel, and to behold the labours of ſuch miſerable apoſtles with indignation and contempt. Such is the judgment paſſed upon theſe miſſionaries, not only by thoſe whom the church of *Rome* places in the liſt of *heretics*, but alſo by many of the moſt pious and eminent of her own doctors, in *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*, and *Italy*.

---

[a] See JOS. FRANC. LAFITAU, *Hiſtoire des Decouvertes et Conquêtes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde*, tom. iii. p. 420. All the relations given by this eloquent writer (who was afterwards created biſhop of *Siſteron*) are taken from the Portugueſe hiſtorians—The other writers who have caſt light upon this part of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Salutar. Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, cap. 42, 43. 48. and 49.

The zeal of the Roman pontifs in the propagation of Chriſtianity.

II. When the Roman pontifs ſaw their ambition checked by the progreſs of the Reformation, which deprived them of a great part of their ſpiritual dominion in *Europe*, they turned their lordly views towards the other parts of the globe, and became more ſolicitous than ever about the propagation of the goſpel among the nations that lay yet involved in the darkneſs of paganiſm. This they conſidered as the beſt method of making amends for the loſs they had ſuſtained in *Europe*, and the moſt ſpecious pretext for aſſuming to themſelves, with ſome appearance of juſtice, the titles of heads or parents of the univerſal church. The famous ſociety, which, in the year 1540, took the denomination of *jeſuits*, or, *the company of* JESUS, ſeemed every way proper to aſſiſt the court of *Rome* in the execution of this extenſive deſign. And accordingly, from their firſt riſe, this peculiar charge was given them, that they ſhould form a certain number of their order for the propagation of Chriſtianity among the unenlightened nations, and that theſe miſſionaries ſhould be at the abſolute diſpoſal of the Roman pontif, and always ready, at a moment's warning, to repair to whatever part of the world he ſhould ſix for the exerciſe of their miniſtry [*b*]. The many hiſtories and relations which mention the labours, perils, and exploits of that prodigious multitude of jeſuits, who were employed in the converſion of the African, American, and Indian infidels, abundantly ſhew, with what fidelity and zeal the members of this ſociety executed the orders of the Roman pontifs [*c*]. And their labours would have undoubtedly crowned them with immortal glory, had it not appeared evident, from the moſt authentic records, that the greateſt part of theſe new apoſtles had more in view the promoting the ambitious views of *Rome*, and the advancing the intereſts of their own ſociety, than the propagation of the Chriſtian religion, or the honour of its divine Author [*d*]. It may alſo be

---

☞ [*b*] When the fanatic IGNATIUS firſt ſolicited the confirmation of his order by the Roman pontif, PAUL III., the learned and worthy cardinal GUIDICCIONI oppoſed his requeſt with great vehemence. But this oppoſition was vanquiſhed by the dexterity of IGNATIUS, who, changing the articles of his *inſtitution*, in which he had promiſed obedience to the pope '*with certain reſtrictions*,' turned it in ſuch a manner as to bind his order by a ſolemn vow of *implicit*, *blind*, and *unlimited ſubmiſſion* and *obedience* to the Roman pontif. This change produced the deſired effect, and made the popes look upon the jeſuits as the chief ſupport of their authority; and hence the zeal which *Rome* has ever ſhewn for that order, and that even at preſent, when their ſecret enormities have been brought to light, and procured the ſuppreſſion of their ſociety in *Portugal* and in *France*, where their power was ſo extenſive. It is indeed remarkable, that IGNATIUS and his company, in the very ſame charter of their order in which they declare their implicit and blind allegiance to the court of *Rome*, promiſe a like implicit and unlimited allegiance to the general of their ſociety, notwithſtanding the impoſſibility of ſerving two abſolute maſters, whoſe commands may be often contradictory. See *Hiſtoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, printed at *Utrecht* in 1741, tom. i. p. 77, &c.

[*c*] See JO. ALB. FABRICII *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, cap. xxxiii. p. 550.

[*d*] B. CHRIST. EBERH. WEISMANNI *Oratio de virtutibus et vitiis Miſſion. Romanar: in Oratt. ejus Academ.* p. 286.

affirmed, from records of the higheſt credit and authority, that the *inquiſition* erected by the jeſuits at *Goa*, and the penal laws whoſe terrors they employed ſo freely in propagation of the goſpel; contributed, much more than their arguments and exhortations; which were but ſparingly uſed, to engage the Indians to embrace Chriſtianity [*e*]. The converting zeal of the Franciſcans and Dominicans, which had, for a long time, been not only cooled, but almoſt totally extinguiſhed, was animated anew by the example of the jeſuits. And ſeveral other religious orders, that ſlumbered in their cells, were rouſed from their lethargy, if not by a principle of envy, at leaſt by a ſpirit of emulation.

The propagation of the goſpel in India, Japan, and China.

III. Of all the jeſuits who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their zealous and laborious attempts to extend the limits of the church, none acquired a more ſhining reputation than FRANCIS XAVIER, who is commonly called the *Apoſtle of the Indians* [*f*]. An undaunted reſolution, and no ſmall degree of genius and ſagacity, rendered this famous miſſionary one of the propereſt perſons that could be employed in ſuch an arduous taſk. Accordingly, in the year 1522, he ſet ſail for the Portugueſe ſettlements in *India*, and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, ſpread the knowledge of the Chriſtian, or, to ſpeak more properly, of the popiſh religion, over a great part of the continent, and in ſeveral of the iſlands of that remote region. From thence, in the year 1529, he paſſed into *Japan*, and laid there with amazing rapidity the foundations of the famous church, which flouriſhed, during ſo many years, in that vaſt empire. His indefatigable zeal prompted him to attempt the converſion of the Chineſe; and with this view he embarked for that extenſive and powerful kingdom, in ſight of which he ended his days in the year 1552 [g]. After his death, other members of his inſinuating order penetrated into *China*. The chief of theſe was MATTHEW RICCI, an Italian, who, by his ſkill in the Mathematics, became ſo acceptable to the Chineſe nobility, and even to their emperor, that he obtained, both for himſelf and his aſſociates, the liberty of explaining to the people the doctrines of the goſpel [h]. This famous miſſionary may, therefore, be conſidered as the parent and founder of the Chriſtian churches, which, though often diſperſed and toſſed to and fro by the ſtorms of perſecution, ſubſiſt, nevertheleſs, ſtill in *China* [i].

[*e*] See the *Hiſt. de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. ii. p. 171. 207.

[*f*] The late king of *Portugal* obtained for XAVIER, or rather for his memory, the title of *Protector of the Indies*, from BENEDICT XIV., in the year 1747. See the *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuſes des Miſſions Etrangeres*, tom. xliii. *Pref.* p. 36. The body of this ſainted miſſionary lies interred at *Goa*, where it is worſhipped with the higheſt marks of devotion. There is alſo a magnificent church at *Cotati* dedicated to XAVIER, to whom the inhabitants of that Portugueſe ſettlement pay the moſt devout tribute of veneration and worſhip. See *Lettres Edifiantes*, &c. tom. iii. p. 85. 89. 203. tom. v. p. 38—48. tom. vi. p. 78.

The attempts of the proteſtants towards the propagation of the goſpel in foreign parts.

IV. The juriſdiction and territories of thoſe princes, who had thrown off the papal yoke, being confined within the limits of *Europe*, the churches that were under their protection could contribute but little to the propagation of the goſpel in thoſe diſtant regions of which we have been ſpeaking. It is, however, recorded in hiſtory, that, in the year 1556, fourteen proteſtant miſſionaries were ſent from *Geneva* to convert the Americans [*k*], though it is not well known who was the promoter of this pious deſign, nor with what ſucceſs it was carried into execution. The Engliſh alſo, who, towards the concluſion of this century, ſent colonies into the northern parts of *America*, tranſplanted with them the reformed religion, which they themſelves profeſſed; and, as their poſſeſſions were extended and multiplied from time to time, their religion alſo made a conſiderable progreſs among that rough and uncivilized people. We learn, moreover, that about this time the Swedes exerted their religious zeal in converting to Chriſtianity many of the inhabitants of *Finland* and *Lapland*, of whom a conſiderable number had hitherto retained the impious and extravagant ſuperſtitions of their Pagan anceſtors.

---

[g] See the writers enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii*, &c. cap. xxxix. p. 677. Add to theſe, LAFITAU, *Hiſtoire des Decouvertes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde*, tom. iii. p. 419. 424. tom. iv. p. 63. 102.—*Hiſtoire de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. i. p. 92.

[h] B. DU HALDE, *Deſcription de l'Empire de la Chine*, tom. iii. p. 84. edit. *Holland*.

[i] It appears however, that before the arrival of RICCI in *China*, ſome of the Dominicans had already been there, though to little purpoſe. See LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 1354.

The enemies of Chriſtianity.

V. It does not appear, from authentic records of hiſtory, that the ſword of perſecution was drawn againſt the Goſpel, or any public oppoſition made to the progreſs of Chriſtianity, during this century. And it would betray a great ignorance, both of the ſituation, opinions, and maxims of the Turks, to imagine, that the war they waged againſt the Chriſtians was carried on upon religious principles, or with a view to maintain and promote the doctrines of MAHOMET. On the other hand, it is certain, that there lay concealed, in different parts of *Europe*, ſeveral perſons, who entertained a virulent enmity againſt religion in general, and, in a more eſpecial manner, againſt the religion of the goſpel; and who, both in their writings and in private converſation, ſowed the ſeeds of impiety and error, and inſtilled their odious principles into weak, unſteady, and credulous minds. In this pernicious and unhappy claſs are generally placed ſeveral of the Peripatetic philoſophers, who adorned *Italy* by their erudition, and particularly POMPONATIUS; ſeveral French wits and philoſophers, ſuch as JOHN BODIN, RABELAIS, MONTAGNE, BONAVENTURE DES PERIERES, DOLET, CHARRON; ſeveral Italians, at whoſe head appears the Roman pontif LEO X, followed by PETER BEMBO, POLITIAN, JORDANO BRUNO, OCHINO; and ſome Germans, ſuch as THEOPHRASTUS PARACELSUS, NICHOLAS TAURELLUS, and others [*l*]. It is even reported, that, in certain provinces of *France* and *Italy*, ſchools were erected, from whence whole ſwarms of theſe impious doctors ſoon iſſued out to deceive the ſimple and unwary. This accuſation will not be rejected in the lump, by ſuch as are acquainted with the ſpirit and genius of theſe times; nor can it be ſaid with truth, that all the perſons charged with this heavy reproach were entirely guiltleſs. It is nevertheleſs certain, on the other hand, that, upon an accurate and impartial examination of this matter, it will appear, that the accuſation brought againſt many of them is entirely groundleſs; and that, with reſpect to ſeveral who may be worthy of cenſure in a certain degree, their errors are leſs pernicious and criminal, than they are uncharitably or raſhly repreſented to be.

[*k*] PICTETI *Oratio de Trophæis Chriſti*, in *Orat. ejus*, p. 570.—There is no doubt, but that the doctors here mentioned were thoſe which the illuſtrious admiral COLIGNI invited into *France*, when, in the year 1555, he had formed the project of ſending a colony of proteſtants into *Brazil* and *America*. See CHARLEVOIX, *Hiſtoire de la Nouvelle France*, tom. i. p. 22.

[*l*] See REIMANNI *Hiſtoria Atheiſmi et Atheorum. Hildeſ.* 1725, in 8vo.—JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, *Theſibus de Atheiſmo et Superſtitione*, cap. i.—*Dictionnaire de* BAYLE, paſſim.

VI. It

The public advantages that aroſe from the reſtoration of letters.

VI. It is, at the ſame time, evident, that, in this century, the arts and ſciences were carried to a degree of perfection unknown to preceding ages; and from this happy renovation of learning, the European churches derived the moſt ſignal and ineſtimable advantages, which they alſo tranſmitted to the moſt remote and diſtant nations. The benign influence of true ſcience, and its tendency to improve both the form of religion and the inſtitutions of civil policy, were perceived by many of the ſtates and princes of *Europe*. Hence large ſums were expended, and great zeal and induſtry employed, in promoting the progreſs of knowledge, by founding and encouraging literary ſocieties, by protecting and exciting a ſpirit of emulation among men of genius, and by annexing diſtinguiſhed honours and advantages to the culture of the ſciences. And it is particularly worthy of obſervation, that this was the period, when the wiſe and ſalutary law, which excludes ignorant and illiterate perſons from the ſacred functions of the Chriſtian miniſtry, acquired, at length, that force which it ſtill retains in the greateſt part of the Chriſtian world. There ſtill remained, however, ſome ſeeds of that ancient diſcord between religion and philoſophy, that had been ſown and fomented by ignorance and fanaticiſm; and there were found, both among the friends and enemies of the Reformation, ſeveral well-meaning, but inconſiderate men, who, in ſpite of common ſenſe, maintained with more vehemence and animoſity than ever, that vital religion and piety could never flouriſh until it was totally ſeparated from learning and ſcience, and nouriſhed by the holy ſimplicity that reigned in the primitive ages of the church.

The flouriſhing ſtate of philoſophy.

VII. The firſt rank in the literary world was now held by thoſe, who conſecrated their ſtudious hours and their critical ſagacity to the publication, correction, and illuſtration of the moſt famous Greek and Latin authors of ancient times, to the ſtudy of antiquity and the languages, and to the culture of eloquence and poetry. We ſee by the productions of this age (that yet remain, and continue to excite the admiration of the learned), that in all the provinces of *Europe* theſe branches of literature were cultivated with a kind of enthuſiaſm, by ſuch as were moſt diſtinguiſhed by their taſte and genius; nay, what is ſtill more extraordinary (and perhaps not a little extravagant), the welfare of the church, and the proſperity of the ſtate, was ſuppoſed to depend upon the improvement of theſe branches of erudition, which were conſidered as the very eſſence of true and ſolid knowledge. If ſuch encomiums were ſwelled beyond the bounds of truth and wiſdom by enthuſiaſtical philologiſts, it is, nevertheleſs, certain, that the ſpecies of learning, here under conſideration, was of the higheſt importance, as it opened the way that led to the treaſures of ſolid wiſdom, to the improvement of genius, and thus undoubtedly contributed, in a great meaſure, to deliver both reaſon and religion from the prepoſſeſſions of ignorance, and the ſervitude of ſuperſtition [m]. And, therefore, we ought not to be

---

☞ [m] Many vehement debates have been carried on concerning the reſpective merit of *Literature* and *Philoſophy*. But theſe debates are almoſt as abſurd, as a compariſon that ſhould be made between the *means* and the *end*, the *inſtrument* and its *effect*. *Literature* is the key by which we often open the treaſures of wiſdom, both human and divine. But as the ſordid miſer converts abſurdly the means into an end, and acquires a paſſion for the ſhining metal, conſidered abſtractedly from the purpoſes it was deſigned to ſerve, ſo the pedantic philologiſt erects literature into an independent ſcience, and contemns the divine treaſures of philoſophy, which it was deſigned both to diſcover and to illuſtrate. Hence that wretched tribe of *word-catchers that live on ſyllables* (as Pope, I think, happily expreſſes their taſteleſs purſuits), who make the republic of letters be ſurpriſed, when we meet with perſons who exaggerate the merit, and dwell beyond meaſure on the praiſes, of thoſe who were our firſt guides from the regions of darkneſs and error, into the luminous paths of evidence and truth.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

VIII. Though the lovers of philology and Belles Lettres were much ſuperior in number to thoſe who turned their principal views to the ſtudy of philoſophy, yet the latter were far from being contemptible either in point of number or capacity. The philoſophers were divided into two claſſes, of which the one was wholly abſorbed in contemplation, while the other was employed in the inveſtigation of truth, and endeavoured by experience, as well as by reaſoning, to trace out the laws and operations of Nature. The former were ſubdivided into two ſects, of which the one followed certain leaders, while the other, unreſtrained by the dictates of authority, ſtruck out a new way for themſelves, following freely their own inventions. Thoſe who ſubmitted to the direction of certain philoſophical guides, enliſted themſelves under the ſtandards of ARISTOTLE, or thoſe of PLATO, who continued ſtill to have many admirers, eſpecially in *Italy*. Nor were the followers of ARISTOTLE agreed among themſelves; they all acknowledged the Stagirite as their chief, but they followed him through very different paths. Some were for retaining the ancient method of proceeding in philoſophical purſuits, which their doctors falſely called the Peripatetic ſyſtem. Others pleaded for the pure and unmixed philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, and recommended the writings of that Grecian ſage as

letters groan under their commentaries, annotations, various readings, &c. and forget that the knowledge of *words* and languages was intended to lead us to the improvement of the mind, and to the knowledge of *things*.

the ſource of wiſdom, and as the ſyſtem which was moſt adapted, when properly illuſtrated and explained, to the inſtruction of youth. A third ſort of Ariſtotelians, who differed equally from thoſe now mentioned, and of whom the celebrated MELANCTHON was the chief, purſued another method. They extracted the marrow out of the lucubrations of ARISTOTLE, illuſtrated it by the aids of genuine literature and the rules of good criticiſm, and corrected it by the dictates of right reaſon and the doctrines and principles of true religion.

Of thoſe who ſtruck out a path to themſelves in the regions of philoſophy, without any regard to that which had been opened by ancient ſages, and purſued by their followers, CARDAN [n], TELESIUS [o], and CAMPA-

---

☞ [n] CARDAN was a man of a bold, irregular, enterprizing genius, who, by a wild imagination, was led into the ſtudy of aſtrology and magic, by which he excited the aſtoniſhment and attracted the veneration of the multitude, while his real merit as a philoſopher was little known. He was accuſed of atheiſm, but ſeems much rather chargeable with ſuperſtition. His life and character was an amazing mixture of wiſdom and folly, and nothing can give a more unfavourable idea of his temper and principles, than the hideous portrait he has drawn of himſelf in his book *De genituris*. His knowledge of phyſic and mathematics was conſiderable, and his notions of natural philoſophy may be ſeen in his famous book *De ſubtilitate et veritate rerum*, in which ſome important truths and diſcoveries are mixed with the moſt fanatical viſions, and the moſt extravagant and delirious effuſions of myſtical folly. See the ample and judicious account that has been given of the character and philoſophy of this writer (whoſe voyage to *England* and *Scotland* is well known) by the learned BRUCKER, in his *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iv. part II. lib. i. cap. iii.

☞ [o] This philoſopher, leſs known than the former, was born A. D. 1508, at *Coſenſa*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, and was the reſtorer of the philoſophy formerly taught by PARMENIDES, upon whoſe principles he built a new ſyſtem, or, at leaſt, a ſyſtem which appeared new, by the elegant connexion

which

CAMPANELLA [p], hold, deſervedly, the firſt rank, as they were undoubtedly men of ſuperior genius,

---

which TELESIUS gave to its various parts, and the arguments uſed to maintain and ſupport it againſt the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE. It was the vague and uncertain method of reaſoning, which the Stagirite had introduced into natural philoſophy, that engaged TELESIUS to compoſe his famous book *De principiis rerum naturalium*. In this work, after having refuted the viſionary principles of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, he ſubſtitutes in their place, ſuch as are immediately derived from the teſtimony of the ſenſes, even *heat* and *cold*, from which, like PARMENIDES, he deduces the nature, origin, qualities, and changes of all material beings. To theſe two principles he adds a third, *viz. Matter*, and on theſe three builds, with dexterity enough, his phyſical ſyſtem; for a part of which he ſeems alſo to have been indebted to a book of PLUTARCH, *De primo frigido*. It will be entertaining to the philoſophical reader to compare this work of TELESIUS, with Lord BACON's phyſical account of the ſtory of CUPID and COELUS, in his book *De principiis et originibus*, &c.

☞ [p] CAMPANELLA, a native of *Calabria*, made a great noiſe in the ſeventeenth century, by his innovations in philoſophy. Shocked at the atheiſm and abſurdities of the Ariſtotelian ſyſtem, he acquired early a contempt of it, and turned his purſuits towards ſomething more ſolid, peruſing the writings of all the ancient ſages, and comparing them with the great volume of Nature, to ſee whether the pretended copies reſembled the original. The ſufferings that this man endured are almoſt incredible; but they were ſaid to be inflicted on him in conſequence of the treaſonable practices that were imputed to him, partly againſt the court of *Spain*, and partly againſt the kingdom of *Naples*, which he had formed the deſign of delivering into the hands of the Turks. He was freed from his priſon and tortures by the interpoſition of pope URBAN VIII., who gave him particular marks of his favour and eſteem; and, finding that he was not ſafe at *Rome*, had him conveyed to *Paris*, where he was honoured with the protection of LEWIS XIII. and cardinal RICHLIEU, and ended his days in peace. As to the writings and philoſophy of this great man, they are tinged, indeed, with the colour of the times, and bear, in many places, the marks of a chimerical and undiſciplined imagination; but, among a few viſionary notions, they contain a great number of important truths. He undertook an entire reformation of philoſophy, but was unequal to the taſk. For an account of his principles of logic, ethics, and natural philoſophy, ſee BRUCKER's *Hiſt. Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iv. part II. p. 127, &c. He was accuſed of atheiſm, genius, though too much addicted to the ſuggeſtions and viſions of an irregular fancy. To theſe may be added PETER RAMUS, that ſubtile and ingenious French philoſopher, who, by attempting to ſubſtitute in the place of ARISTOTLE's logic, a method of reaſoning more adapted to the uſe of rhetoric and the improvement of eloquence, excited ſuch a terrible uproar in the Gallic ſchools. Nor muſt we omit here the mention of THEOPHRASTUS PARACELSUS, who, by an aſſiduous obſervation of nature, by a great number of experiments indefatigably repeated, and by applying the penetrating force of fire [q] to diſcover the firſt principles of elements of bodies, endeavoured to caſt new light and evidence on the important ſcience of natural philoſophy. As the reſearches of this induſtrious inquirer into nature excited the admiration of all, his example was conſequently followed by many; and hence aroſe a new ſect of philoſophers, who aſſumed the denomination of *Theoſophiſts* [r], and who, placing little confidence in the deciſions of human reaſon,

---

atheiſm, but unjuſtly; he was alſo accuſed of ſuggeſting cruel meaſures againſt the proteſtants, and not without reaſon.

☞ [q] The principal merit of PARACELSUS conſiſted in inventing, or at leaſt reſtoring from oblivion and darkneſs, the important ſcience of *Chemiſtry*, giving it a regular form, reducing it into a connected ſyſtem, and applying it moſt ſucceſsfully to the art of healing, which was the peculiar profeſſion of this philoſopher, whoſe friends and enemies have drawn him in the falſeſt colours. His application to the ſtudy of *Magic*, which he treats of in the tenth volume of his works, under the denomination of the *Sagacious Philoſophy*, is a circumſtance diſhonourable to his memory, and nothing can diſcover a more total abſence of common ſenſe and reaſon than his diſcourſes on that ſubject. As to his philoſophical ſyſtem, it is ſo obſcure and ſo contradictory, that we ſhall not pretend to delineate it here.

[r] See, for an ample account of the lives, tranſactions, and ſyſtems of theſe philoſophers, BRUCKER's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*.

or the efforts of ſpeculation, attributed all to divine illumination and repeated experience.

The method of teaching theology improved,

IX. This revolution in philoſophy and literature, together with the ſpirit of emulation that animated the different ſects or claſſes into which the learned men of this age were divided, produced many happy effects of various kinds. It, in a more particular manner, brought into diſrepute, though it could not at once utterly eradicate, that intricate, barbarous, and inſipid method of teaching theology, that had univerſally prevailed hitherto in all the ſchools and pulpits of Chriſtendom. The ſacred writings, which, in the preceding ages, had been either entirely neglected, or very abſurdly explained, were now much more conſulted and reſpected in the debates and writings of the Chriſtian doctors than they had formerly been; the ſenſe and language of the inſpired writers were more carefully ſtudied and more accurately unfolded; the doctrines and precepts of religion taught with more method, connexion, and perſpicuity; and that dry, barren, and unaffecting language, which the ancient ſchoolmen affected ſo much in their theological compoſitions, was wholly exploded by the wiſer part of the divines of this century. It muſt not however be imagined, that this reformation of the ſchools was ſo perfect, as to leave no new improvements to be made in ſucceeding ages; this, indeed, was far from being the caſe. Much imperfection yet remained in the method of treating theology, and many things, which had great need of a correcting hand, were left untouched. It would, nevertheleſs, be either an inſtance of ingratitude, or a mark of great ignorance, to deny this age the honour of having begun what was afterwards more happily finiſhed, and of having laid the foundations of that ſtriking ſuperiority, which the divines of ſucceeding ages obtained over thoſe of ancient times.

and the genius and ſpirit of the Chriſtian religion better explained.

X. Nor did the improvements, which have been now mentioned, as proceeding from the reſtoration of letters and philoſophy, extend only to the method of conveying theological inſtruction, but purified moreover the ſcience of theology itſelf. For the true nature, genius, and deſign of the Chriſtian religion, which even the moſt learned and pious doctors of antiquity had but imperfectly comprehended, were now unfolded with evidence and preciſion, and drawn, like truth, from an abyſs in which they had hitherto lain too much concealed. It is true, the influence of error was far from being totally ſuppreſſed, and many falſe and abſurd doctrines are ſtill maintained and propagated in the Chriſtian world. But it may nevertheleſs be affirmed, that the Chriſtian ſocieties, whoſe errors at this day are the moſt numerous and extravagant, have much leſs abſurd and perverſe notions of the nature and deſign of the goſpel, and the duties and obligations of thoſe that profeſs it, than were entertained by thoſe doctors of antiquity, who ruled the church with an abſolute authority, and were conſidered as the chief oracles of theology. It may further be obſerved, that the Reformation contributed much to ſoften and civilize the manners of many nations, who, before that happy period, were ſunk in the moſt ſavage ſtupidity, and carried the moſt rude and unſociable aſpect. It muſt indeed be confeſſed, that a variety of circumſtances combined to produce that lenity of character, and that milder temperature of manners, maxims, and actions, that diſcovered themſelves gradually, and increaſed, from day to day, in the greateſt part of the European nations after the period that LUTHER rendered ſo famous. It is nevertheleſs evident beyond all contradiction, that the diſputes con-

CENT. XVI. SECT. II.

cerning religion, and the accurate and rational inquiries into the doctrines and duties of Chriſtianity, to which theſe diſputes gave riſe, had a great tendency to eradicate out of the minds of men that ferocity that had been ſo long nouriſhed by the barbarous ſuggeſtions of unmanly ſuperſtition. It is alſo certain, that at the very dawn of this happy revolution in the ſtate of Chriſtianity, and even before its ſalutary effects were manifeſted in all their extent, pure religion had many ſincere and fervent votaries, though they were concealed from public view by the multitudes of fanatics with which they were ſurrounded on all ſides.

SECTION III.

The PARTICULAR HISTORY *of the* CHURCH.

PART I.

The HISTORY *of the* ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

The HISTORY *of the* ROMAN *or* LATIN CHURCH.

The Roman pontif,—how elected.

I. THE Roman or Latin church is a ſyſtem of government, whoſe juriſdiction extends to a great part of the known world, though its authority has been circumſcribed within narrower limits ſince the happy revolution that, in many places, delivered Chriſtianity from the yoke of ſuperſtition and ſpiritual tyranny. This ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical policy, extenſive as it is, is under the direction of the biſhop of *Rome* alone, who, by virtue of a ſort of *hereditary ſucceſſion*, claims the authority, prerogatives, and rights of St. PETER, the *ſuppoſed* prince of the apoſtles, and gives himſelf out for the *ſupreme head* of the univerſal church, the *vicegerent* of Chriſt upon earth. This lordly ruler of the church is, at this time, elected to his high office by the choſen members of the Roman clergy, who bear the ancient denomination of *cardinals*. Of theſe, *ſix* are *biſhops* within the precincts of *Rome*; *fifty* are miniſters of the Roman churches, and are called *prieſts* or preſbyters; and *fourteen* are inſpectors of the hoſpitals and charity-houſes, and are called *deacons*. Theſe *cardinals*, while the papal chair is vacant, and they are employed in the choice of a ſucceſſor to the deceaſed pontif, are ſhut up, and cloſely confined in a certain ſort of priſon, called the *Conclave*, that they may thus be engaged to bring this difficult matter to a ſpeedy concluſion. No perſon that is not an Italian by birth, and has not already obtained a place in the college of cardinals, is capable of being raiſed to the head of the church; nor have all the Italian cardinals the privilege of aſpiring to this high office [a]. Some are rendered incapable of filling the papal chair by the place of their birth, others by their manner of life, and a few by other reaſons of a more incidental nature [b]. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the emperor and the kings of *France* and *Spain* have acquired, whether expreſsly by ſtipulation, or imperceptibly through cuſtom, the privilege of excluding from the number of the candidates for this high office, ſuch as they think proper to oppoſe or diſlike. Hence it often happens, that, in the numerous college of cardinals, a very ſmall number are permitted, upon a vacancy, to aſpire at the papacy; the greateſt part being generally prevented by their birth, their character, their cirumſtances, and by the force of political intrigues, from flattering themſelves with the pleaſing hope of aſcending that towering ſummit of eccleſiaſtical power and dominion.

---

[a] See Jo. Frid. Mayeri *Commentarius de Electione Pontif. Romani*, publiſhed in 4to at *Hamburg*, in the year 1691. The ceremonial obſerved in the *election* and *inſtallation* is amply deſcribed by Meuschenius, in a work publiſhed at *Francfort* in the year 1732, under the following title: *Ceremoniale Electionis et Coronationis Pontificis Romani.*

☞ [b] The great obſtacle that prevents ſeveral cardinals from aſpiring at the pontificate, is what they call at *Rome*, *il peccato originale*, or *original ſin*. This mark of excluſion belongs to thoſe who are born ſubjects of ſome crown, or republic, which is not within the bounds of *Italy*, or which are upon a footing of jealouſy with the court of *Rome*. Thoſe alſo who were made cardinals by the nomination of the kings of *France* or *Spain*, or their adherents, are alſo included in this imputation of *original ſin*, which excludes from the papal chair. The accidental circumſtances that exclude certain cardinals from the pontificate, are their being born princes or independent ſovereigns, or their declaring themſelves openly in favour of certain courts, or their family's being too numerous, or their morals being irregular. Even youth, and a good complexion and figure, are conſidered as obſtacles. But all theſe maxims and rules vary and change according to the inconſtant and precarious impulſe of policy and faction.

For an account of the different methods of electing the pope, whether by *compromiſe*, *inſpiration*, *ſcrutiny*, or *acceſs*, (by which latter is meant a *ſecond election*, employed when the other methods fail;) ſee Aymon, *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, edit. 2de, p. 40, &c.

The power of the pope limited.

II. It muſt not be imagined, that the perſonal power and authority of the Roman pontif are circumſcribed by no limits; ſince it is well known, that, in all his deciſions relating to the government of the church, he previouſly conſults the *brethren*, i. e. the cardinals, who compoſe his miniſtry or privy council. Nay more, in matters of religious controverſy and doctrine, he is obliged to aſk the advice and opinion of eminent divines, in order to ſecure his pretended infallibility from the ſuggeſtions of error. Beſides this, all matters, that are not of the higheſt moment and importance, are divided, according to their reſpective nature, into certain claſſes, and left to the management of certain colleges, called *Congregations* [c], in

---

☞ [c] Theſe congregations are as follow: I. *The congregation of the Pope*, inſtituted firſt by SIXTUS V., to prepare the matters that were to be brought before the *conſiſtory*, at which the pontif is always preſent. Hence this is called the *conſiſtorial congregation*, and in it are treated all affairs relative to the erection of biſhoprics and cathedral churches, the reunion or ſuppreſſion of epiſcopal ſees, the alienation of church goods, and the taxes and *annates* that are impoſed upon all benefices in the pope's giving. The cardinal-dean preſides in this aſſembly. II. *The congregation of the Inquiſition*, or (as it is otherwiſe called) *of the Holy Office*, inſtituted by PAUL III., which takes cognizance of hereſies, apoſtacy, magic, and profane writings, which aſſemble thrice in the week, and every Thurſday in preſence of the pope, who preſides in it. The office of *grand inquiſitor*, which encroached upon the prerogatives in every one of which, one or more cardinals preſide.

gatives of the pontif, has been long ſuppreſſed, or rather diſtributed among the cardinals who belong to this congregation, and whoſe deciſions come under the ſupreme cognizance of his Holineſs. III. *The congregation for the propagation of the Roman Catholic Faith,* founded under the pontificate of GREGORY XV., compoſed of eighteen cardinals, one of the ſecretaries of ſtate, a prothonotary, a ſecretary of the inquiſition, and other members of leſs rank. Here it is, that the deliberations are carried on, which relate to the extirpation of hereſy, the appointment of miſſionaries, &c. This *congregation* has built a moſt beautiful and magnificent palace in one of the moſt agreeable ſituations that could be choſen at *Rome,* where proſelytes to popery from foreign countries are lodged and nouriſhed *gratis* in a manner ſuitable to their rank and condition, and inſtructed in thoſe branches of knowledge to which the bent of their genius points. The prelates, curates, and vicars alſo, who are obliged, without any fault of theirs, to abandon the places of their reſidence, are entertained charitably in this noble edifice in a manner proportioned to their ſtation in the church. IV. *The congregation deſigned to explain the deciſions of the council of* Trent. V. *The congregation of the Index,* whoſe principal buſineſs is to examine manuſcripts and books that are deſigned for publication, to decide whether the people may be permitted to read them, to correct thoſe books whoſe errors are not numerous, and which contain uſeful and ſalutary truths, to condemn thoſe whoſe principles are heretical and pernicious, and to grant the peculiar privilege of peruſing heretical books to certain perſons. This congregation, which is ſometimes held in the preſence of the pope, but generally in the palace of the cardinal-preſident, has a more extenſive juriſdiction than that of the inquiſition, as it not only takes cognizance of thoſe books that contain doctrines contrary to the Roman catholic faith, but of thoſe alſo that concern the duties of morality, the diſcipline of the church, and the intereſts of ſociety. Its name is derived from the alphabetical Tables, or *Indexes,* of heretical books and authors, which have been compoſed by its appointment. VI. *The congregation for maintaining the rights and immunities of the clergy, and of the Knights of* Malta. This congregation was formed by URBAN VIII., to decide the diſputes and remove the difficulties and inconveniencies that aroſe from the trials of eccleſiaſtics, before princes, or other lay-judges. VII. *The congregation relating to the Biſhops and regular Clergy,* inſtituted by SIXTUS V., to decide the debates which ariſe between the biſhops and their dioceſans, and to compoſe the differences that happened ſo frequently among the Monaſtic orders.

VIII. *The*

ſide [*d*]. The deciſions of theſe ſocieties are generally approved of by the Roman pontif, who has not a right, without alleging the moſt

VIII. *The congregation*, appointed by Gregory XIV., for examining into the capacity and learning of the biſhops. IX. Another for enquiring into their lives and morals. X. A third for obliging them to reſide in their dioceſes, or to diſpenſe them from that obligation. XI. *The congregation for ſuppreſſing monaſteries*, i. e. ſuch whoſe revenues are exhauſted, and who thereby become a charge upon the public. XII. *The congregation of the Apoſtolic Viſitation*, which names the viſitors, who perform the duties and viſitations of the churches and convents within the diſtrict of *Rome*, to which the pope is obliged as archbiſhop of that city. XIII. *The congregation of Relics*, deſigned to examine the marks, and to augment the number of theſe inſtruments of ſuperſtition. XIV. *The congregation of Indulgences*, deſigned to examine the caſe of thoſe who have recourſe to this method of quieting the conſcience. XV. *The congregation of Rites*, which Sixtus V. appointed to regulate and invent the religious ceremonies that are to be obſerved in the worſhip of each new ſaint that is added to the Kalendar.

Theſe are the congregations of cardinals, ſet apart for adminiſtering the ſpiritual affairs of the church; and they are undoubtedly, in ſome reſpects, a check upon the power of the pontif, enormous as it may be. There are ſix more, which relate to the temporal government of the papal territories. In theſe congregations, where the pope is never preſent, all things are tranſacted which relate to the execution of public juſtice in civil or criminal matters, the levying of taxes, the providing the cities and provinces with good governors, the relieving thoſe who are unjuſtly oppreſſed by ſubordinate magiſtrates, the coinage, the care of the rivers, aqueducts, bridges, roads, churches, and public edifices.

[*d*] The court of *Rome* is very particularly and accurately deſcribed by Aymon (who had been, before his converſion to the proteſtant religion, domeſtic chaplain to Innocent XI.) in a book, entitled, *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, of which the firſt edition was publiſhed at the *Hague*, in 8vo, in the year 1707, and the ſecond in 1726.—See alſo *Relation de la Cour de Rome, et des Ceremonies qui s'y obſervent*, which father Labat has tranſlated into French, from the Italian of Jerom Limadoro, and ſubjoined to his *Voyages en Eſpagne et Italie*, tom. viii. p. 105.—For an account of the Roman congregations, &c. ſee Doroth. Ascian. *De Montibus Pietatis Romanis*, p. 510. as alſo Hunold. Plettenberg, *Notitia Tribunal. et Congregat. Curiæ Romanæ, Hildeſiæ*, in 8vo, 1693.

weighty and evident reaſons, to reverſe what they pronounce to be juſt and expedient. This form of eccleſiaſtical government is, doubtleſs, a check to the authority of the pope; and hence it is, that many things are tranſacted at *Rome* in a manner that is in direct oppoſition to the ſentiments of its ſpiritual ruler. This may ſerve to ſhew us, that thoſe perſons are little acquainted with the nature and limits of the papal hierarchy, who pretend, that all the iniquitous proceedings of the court of *Rome*, the calamities it has occaſioned, the contentions, rebellions, and tumults it has excited, are to be entirely and wholly laid to the charge of the Roman pontif [*e*].

Debates ariſe concerning the power of the Roman pontif.

III. The power of the Roman pontif hath excited debates even among thoſe that are under the papal hierarchy; and the ſpiritual ſubjects of this pretended head of the church, are very far from being agreed with reſpect to the extent of his authority and juriſdiction. Hence it happens, that this authority and dominion are not the ſame in all places, having a larger ſcope in ſome provinces, and being reduced within narrower bounds in others. If, indeed, we conſider only the pretenſions of the pontif, then we ſhall find that his power is unlimited and ſupreme; for there are no prerogatives that can flatter ambition, which he does not claim for himſelf and his court. He not only pretends, that the whole power and majeſty of the church reſide in his perſon, and are tranſmitted into certain portions, from him to the inferior biſhops, but moreover aſſerts the abſolute infallibility of all deciſions and decrees that he pronounces from his lordly tribunal. Theſe arrogant pretenſions are, however, oppoſed by many, and chiefly by the French nation, which expreſsly maintains, that every biſhop receives immediately from Chriſt himſelf a portion of that ſpiritual power which is imparted to the church; that the collective ſum, or whole of this power, is lodged in the collective body of its paſtors, or, which is the ſame thing, in a general council, lawfully aſſembled; and that the pontif, conſidered perſonally, and as diſtinct from the church, is liable to error. This complicated and important controverſy may be eaſily brought within narrower bounds, and may be reduced to the following plain queſtion: *viz. Is the Roman pontif, properly ſpeaking, the* LAWGIVER *of the church*, or, *is he no more than the* GUARDIAN *and* DEPOSITARY *of the laws enacted by Chriſt and by the church?* There is no proſpect of ſeeing this queſtion decided, nor the debates terminated to which it has given riſe; ſince the contending parties are not even agreed about the proper and lawful judge of this important controverſy [*f*]. Some great revolution can only effect the deciſion of this matter.

[*e*] Hence ariſes that important diſtinction, frequently employed by the French and other nations in their debates with the Roman pontif; I mean, the diſtinction between the *Pope of Rome* and the *Court of Rome*. The *latter* is often loaded with the bittereſt reproaches and the heavieſt accuſations, while the *former* is ſpared, and in ſome meaſure excuſed. Nor is this diſtinction by any means groundleſs; ſince the cardinals and congregations, whoſe rights and privileges are held ſacred, undertake and execute many projects without the knowledge, and ſometimes againſt the will and conſent, of the Roman pontif.

The declenſion of the church of *Rome*.

IV. The church of *Rome* loſt much of its ancient ſplendor and majeſty, as ſoon as LUTHER, and

---

[*f*] The arguments employed by the creatures of the Roman pontif in defence of his unlimited authority, may be ſeen in BELLARMINE and other writers, of which an enormous collection has been made by ROCCABERTI; and, what is not a little extraordinary, a French writer, named PETITDIDIER, appeared in defence of the pope's pretenſions, in a book publiſhed at *Luxemburg*, in the year 1724, *Sur l'Authorité et l'Infallibilité dès Papes*. The ſentiments of the Gallican church, and the arguments by which it oppoſes the pretenſions of *Rome*, may be ſeen in the writings of RICHER and LAUNOY.

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART I.

and the other luminaries of the Reformation, had exhibited to the view of the European nations the Chriſtian religion reſtored, at leaſt to a conſiderable part of its native purity, and delivered from many of the ſuperſtitions under which it had lain ſo long disfigured. Among the moſt opulent ſtates of *Europe*, ſeveral withdrew entirely from the juriſdiction of *Rome*; in others, certain provinces threw off the yoke of papal tyranny; and upon the whole, this defection produced a ſtriking diminution both of the wealth and power of the Roman pontifs. It muſt alſo be obſerved, that even the kings, princes, and ſovereign ſtates, who adhered to the religion of *Rome*, yet changed their ſentiments with reſpect to the claims and pretenſions of its biſhop. If they were not perſuaded by the writings of the proteſtants to renounce the ſuperſtitions of popery, yet they received moſt uſeful inſtructions from them in other matters of very great moment. They drew from theſe writings important diſcoveries of the groundleſs claims and unlawful uſurpations of the Roman pontifs, and came, at length, to perceive, that, if the juriſdiction and authority of *Rome* continued the ſame that it was before the riſe of LUTHER, the rights of temporal princes, and the majeſty of civil government would, ſooner or later, be abſorbed in the gulph of papal avarice and ambition. Hence it was, that moſt of the ſovereign ſtates of *Europe*, partly by ſecret and prudent meaſures, partly by public negociations and remonſtrances, ſet bounds to the daring ambition of *Rome*, which aimed at nothing leſs than univerſal dominion both in eccleſiaſtical and civil affairs; nor did the Roman pontif think it either ſafe or expedient to have recourſe to the ancient arms of the church, *war* and *excommunication*, in order to repel theſe attacks upon his authority. Even thoſe very kingdoms, who acknowledged the Roman pontif as the lawgiver of the church, and an infallible guide, confine, nevertheleſs, his power of enacting laws within narrow limits.

The methods employed by the Roman pontifs to repair their loſſes.

V. In this declining ſtate of their affairs, it was natural for the humbled pontifs to look about for ſome method of repairing their loſſes; and, for this purpoſe, they exerted much more zeal and induſtry, than had been ſhewn by their predeceſſors, in extending the limits of their ſpiritual dominion beyond *Europe*, and left no means unemployed of gaining proſelytes and adherents in the *Indies*, both among the pagan nations and the Chriſtian ſects. The Jeſuits, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, were the firſt miſſionaries that were ſent for this purpoſe into theſe diſtant parts of the world; but able men, ſelected out of the other monaſtic orders, were afterwards employed in this arduous undertaking. If, however, we except the exploits of FRANCIS XAVIER, and his companions in *India*, *China*, and *Japan*, of which notice has been taken above, there were no great matters effected in this century; as, generally ſpeaking, the perſons who were ſet apart to execute this grand project, were not as yet endowed with that experience and dexterity that it neceſſarily required, and ſet about the work with more zeal than prudence and knowledge.

Miſſions.

The Portugueſe had, in the preceding century, opened a paſſage into the country of the Abyſſinians, who profeſſed the doctrine, and obſerved the religious rites, of the *Monophyſites*; and this offered a favourable occaſion of reducing this people under the papal yoke. Accordingly, JOHN BERMUDES* was ſent into *Ethiopia* for this purpoſe; and, that he might appear with a certain degree of dignity, he was clothed with the title of *Patriarch of the Abyſſinians*. The ſame important commiſſion was afterwards given to IGNATIUS LOYOLA, and the companions of his labours [g]; and, at their firſt ſetting out, ſeveral circumſtances, and particularly a war with a neighbouring prince, which the Abyſſinian monarch was deſirous of terminating by the powerful ſuccours of the Portugueſe, ſeemed to promiſe them a ſucceſsful and happy miniſtry. But the event did not anſwer this fond expectation; and, in ſome time, it appeared plainly, that the Abyſſinians ſtood too firm in the faith of their anceſtors, to be eaſily engaged to abandon and forſake it; ſo that, towards the concluſion of this century, the Jeſuits had almoſt loſt all hopes of ſucceeding in their attempts [h].

The Egyptians and Armenians.

VI. The *Egyptians*, or *Copts*, who were cloſely connected with the Abyſſinians in their religious ſentiments, and alſo in their external forms of worſhip, became next the objects of *Rome*'s ambitious zeal; and, in the year 1562, CHRISTOPHER RODERIC, a Jeſuit of note, was ſent, by the expreſs order of pope PIUS IV., to propagate the cauſe of popery among that people. This eccleſiaſtic, notwithſtanding the rich preſents and ſubtle arguments by which he attempted to change the ſentiments, and ſhake the conſtancy of GABRIEL [i], who was at that time patriarch of *Alexandria*, returned to *Rome* with no other effect of his embaſſy than fair words, and a few

---

☞ [g] It is certainly by miſtake that Dr. MOSHEIM mentions LOYOLA as having made a voyage into *Abyſſinia*. Jeſuits were ſent, at different periods, to that country, and with little ſucceſs; but their founder was never there in perſon.

[h] See LUDOLFI *Hiſtor. Æthiopica et Comm.*—GEDDES, *Church Hiſtory of Ethiopia*, p. 120.—LE GRAND, *Diſſertation de la Converſion des Abyſſins*, which is to be found in the ſecond volume of the *Voyage Hiſtorique d'Abyſſinie du* R. P. JEROME LOBO, p. 13.—LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme en Ethiopie*, livr. ii. p. 90.

[i] FRANC. SACHINI *Hiſtor. Societat. Jeſu*, part II. lib. v. EUSEB. RENAUD. *Hiſtoria Patriarchar. Alexandrin.* p. 611.—*Hiſt. de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iii. p. 314.

compliments [*k*]. It is however true, that, towards the concluſion of this century, and during the pontificate of CLEMENT VIII., an embaſſy from another patriarch of *Alexandria*, whoſe name was alſo GABRIEL, appeared at *Rome*, and was conſidered as a ſubject of triumph and boaſting by the creatures of the pope [*l*]. But the more candid and ſenſible, even among the Roman-catholics, looked upon this embaſſy, and not without reaſon, as a ſtratagem of the Jeſuits, to perſuade the Abyſſinians (who were ſo prone to follow the example of their brethren of *Alexandria*) to join themſelves to the communion of *Rome*, and to ſubmit to the authority and juriſdiction of its pontif [*m*]. It is at leaſt certain, that, after this ſolemn embaſſy, we do not find in the records of hiſtory the ſmalleſt token of a propenſity in the *Copts* to embrace the doctrine or diſcipline of *Rome*.

Many years before this period, a conſiderable ſect of the Armenians had been accuſtomed to treat the Roman pontif with particular marks of

---

☞ [*k*] This patriarch offered to ſend one of his biſhops to the council of *Trent*, in order to get rid of the importunity of theſe Jeſuits; but he refuſed poſitively the ſending any of his young ſtudents to be educated among their order, and declared plainly, that he owed no obedience nor ſubmiſſion to the biſhop of *Rome*, who had no more dignity nor authority than any other biſhop, except within the bounds of his own dioceſe. See *Hiſtoire des Religieux de la Campagn. de Jeſus*, tom. ii. p. 322. 324.

[*l*] The tranſactions of this embaſſy, adorned with an ample and pompous Preface, are ſubjoined to the ſixth volume of the *Annal. Eccl.* of BARONIUS, p. 707. edit. *Antwerp.*

[*m*] RENAUDOT, in his *Hiſt. Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 611, 612. endeavours to maintain the credit and importance of this embaſſy, of which BARONIUS has given ſuch a pompous account. He is however much miſtaken when he aſſerts, that Father SIMON, relying upon the fallacious teſtimony of GEORGE DOUZA, was the only perſon that ever conſidered this embaſſy as a ſtratagem; ſince it is evident, that THOMAS A JESU, in the ſixth book of his treatiſe *De converſione omnium gentium procuranda*, has conſidered it in the ſame light, as well as ſeveral other writers. See GEDDES, *Church-Hiſtory of Ethiopia*, p. 231, 232.

veneration and reſpect, without departing, however, from the religious doctrine, diſcipline, or worſhip of their anceſtors. Of this a farther account ſhall be given in the Hiſtory of the Eaſtern Churches; it may, nevertheleſs, be proper to obſerve here, that the attachment of this ſect to the biſhop of *Rome* was greatly increaſed, and the votaries of the pontif conſiderably multiplied, by the zeal of ZERAPION, an opulent man, who was entirely devoted to the court of *Rome*, and who, by engaging himſelf to diſcharge the debts under which the Armenians groaned, obtained, in the year 1593, the title and dignity of Patriarch, though there were already two patriarchs at the head of the Armenian church. He did not, however, enjoy this dignity long; for, ſoon after his promotion, he was ſent into exile by the Perſian monarch, at the deſire of thoſe Armenians who adhered to the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline of their anceſtors; and thus the boaſting and exultation of the Romans ſubſided all of a ſudden, and their hopes vaniſhed [n].

Neſtorians and Indians.

VII. The ambitious views of the Roman pontifs ſowed the peſtilential ſeeds of animoſity and diſcord among all the eaſtern churches; and the Neſtorian Chriſtians, who are alſo known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, felt early the effects of their imperious councils. In the year 1551, a warm diſpute aroſe among that people about the creation of a new patriarch, SIMEON BARMAMAS being propoſed by one party, and SULAKA earneſtly deſired by the other. The latter, to ſupport his pretenſions the more effectually, repaired to *Rome*, and was conſecrated patriarch, in the year 1553, by pope JULIUS III., whoſe juriſdiction he had acknowledged, and to whoſe commands he had promiſed unlimited ſubmiſſion and obedience. JULIUS gave the name JOHN to the new Chaldean patriarch, and, upon his return to his own country, ſent with him ſeveral perſons, ſkilled in the Syriac language, to aſſiſt him in eſtabliſhing and extending the papal empire among the Neſtorians. From this time that unhappy people were divided into two factions, and were often involved in the greateſt dangers and difficulties by the jarring ſentiments and perpetual quarrels of their patriarchs [o].

---

[n] See *Nouveaux Mémoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus dans le Levant*, tom. iii. p. 132, 133.

The Neſtorians, or, as they are more commonly called, the *Chriſtians of St.* THOMAS, who inhabited the maritime coaſts of *India*, ſuffered much from the methods employed by the Portugueſe to engage them to embrace the doctrine and diſcipline of the church of *Rome*, and to abandon the religion of their anceſtors, which was much more ſimple, and infinitely leſs abſurd [p]. The finiſhing ſtroke was put to the violence and brutality of theſe attempts by Don ALEXIS DE MENEZES, biſhop of *Goa*, who, about the concluſion of this century, calling the Jeſuits to his aſſiſtance, obliged this unhappy and reluctant people to embrace the religion of *Rome*, and to acknowledge the pope's ſupreme juriſdiction; againſt both of which acts they had always expreſſed the utmoſt abhorrence. Theſe violent counſels and arrogant proceedings of MENEZES, and his aſſociates, were condemned by ſome of the Roman-catholics as were moſt remarkable for their equity and wiſdom [q].

---

[o] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Oriental. Clementino-Vaticana*, tom. iii. part II. p. 164.—See the *Hiſtory of the Eaſtern Church*, in the following chapter of this hiſtory.

☞ [p] For an account of the doctrines and worſhip of theſe, and the other eaſtern Chriſtians, ſee the following *Chapter*:—As alſo two learned books of Monſieur LA CROZE, the one entitled, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*; and the other, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme en Ethiopie*.

[q] See LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme aux Indes*, livr. ii. p. 88. &c. in which there is an ample account of the *Chriſtians of St.* THOMAS, and of the rough methods employed by MENEZES to gain them over to the church of *Rome*.

VIII. The greateſt part of the firſt legates and miſſionaries of the court of *Rome* treated with much ſeverity and injuſtice the Chriſtians whom they were deſirous of gaining over to their communion. For they did not only require that theſe Chriſtians ſhould renounce the particular opinions that ſeparated them from the Greek and Latin churches, and that they ſhould acknowledge the Roman pontif as CHRIST's ſole *vicegerent* upon earth: their demands were ſtill farther; they oppoſed many of the opinions of this people, ſome of which were at leaſt worthy of toleration, and others highly agreeable to the dictates both of reaſon and ſcripture; they inſiſted upon the ſuppreſſion and abolition of ſeveral cuſtoms, rites, and inſtitutions, which had been handed down to them from their anceſtors, and which were perfectly innocent in their nature and tendency; in a word, they would be ſatisfied with nothing leſs than an entire and minute conformity of the religious rites and opinions of this people, with the doctrine and worſhip of the church of *Rome.* The papal court, however, rendered wiſe by experience, perceived at length that this manner of proceeding was highly imprudent, and every way improper to extend the limits of the papal empire in the Eaſt. It was therefore determined to treat with more artifice and moderation a matter of ſuch moment and importance, and the miſſionaries were, conſequently, ordered to change the plan of their operations, and confine their views to the two following points: to wit, the ſubjection of theſe Chriſtians to the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, and their renouncing, or at leaſt profeſſing to renounce, the opinions that had been condemned in the general councils of the church. In all other matters, the Roman envoys were commanded to uſe a perfect toleration, and to let theſe people remain unmoleſted in following the ſentiments, and obſerving the inſtitutions, they had derived from their anceſtors. To give the greater credit and plauſibility to this new method of converſion, certain learned doctors of the church endeavoured to demonſtrate, that the religious tenets of *Rome*, when explained according to the ſimplicity of truth, and not by the ſubtilties and definitions of the ſchools, differed very little from the opinions received in the Greek and the other eaſtern churches. But this demonſtration was very far from being ſatisfactory, and it diſcovered leſs of an ingenuous ſpirit, than a diſpoſition to gain proſelytes by all ſorts of means, and at all events. Be that as it may, the cauſe of *Rome* received much more advantage from this plan of moderation, than it had derived from the ſeverity of its former counſels; though much leſs than the authors of this reconciling plan fondly expected.

The internal conſtitution of the church of *Rome* ſtrengthened in various ways.

IX. While the Roman pontifs were uſing their utmoſt efforts to extend their dominion abroad, they did not neglect the means that were proper to ſtrengthen and maintain it at home. On the contrary, from the dawn of the Reformation, they began to redouble their diligence in defending the internal form and conſtitution of the church of *Rome* againſt the dexterity and force of its adverſaries. They could no more have recourſe to the expedient of *cruſades*, by which they had ſo often diminiſhed the power and influence of their enemies. The revolutions that had happened in the affairs of *Rome*, and in the ſtate of *Europe*, rendered any ſuch method of ſubduing heretics viſionary and impracticable. Other methods were, therefore, to be found out, and all the reſources of prudence were to be exhauſted in ſupport of a declining church. Hence the laws and procedures of the *inquiſition* were reviſed and corrected in thoſe countries, where that formidable court is permitted to exert its dreadful power.

Colleges,

Colleges, and ſchools of learning, were erected in various places, in which the ſtudious youth were trained up, by perpetual exerciſe, in the art of diſputing, that thus they might wield, with more dexterity and ſucceſs, the arms of controverſy againſt the enemies of *Rome*. The circulation of ſuch books as were ſuppoſed to have a pernicious tendency, was either entirely prevented, or at leaſt much obſtructed, by certain liſts, or indexes, compoſed by men of learning and ſagacity, and publiſhed by authority, in which theſe books were marked with a note of infamy, and their peruſal prohibited, though with certain reſtrictions. The purſuit of knowledge was earneſtly recommended to the clergy, and honourable marks of diſtinction, as well as ample rewards, were beſtowed on thoſe who made the moſt remarkable progreſs in the cultivation of letters. And, to enlarge no farther on this head, the youth, in general, were more carefully inſtructed in the principles and precepts of their religion, than they had formerly been. Thus it happens, that ſignal advantages are frequently derived from what are looked upon as the greateſt evils, and much wiſdom and improvement are daily acquired in the ſchool of oppoſition and adverſity. It is more than probable, that the church of *Rome* would never have been enriched with the acquiſitions we have now been mentioning, had it continued in that ſtate of uninterrupted eaſe and undiſputed authority that nouriſh a ſpirit of indolence and luxury; and had not the pretended heretics attacked its territories, trampled upon its juriſdiction, and eclipſed a great part of its ancient majeſty and ſplendour.

Ignatius Loyola the founder of the order called Jeſuits.

X. The Monaſtic orders and religious ſocieties have been always conſidered by the Roman pontifs as the principal ſupport of their authority and dominion. It is chiefly by them that they rule the church, maintain their influence on the minds of the people, and augment the number of their votaries. And, indeed, various cauſes contribute to render the connexion between the pontif and theſe religious communities much more intimate, than that which ſubſiſts between him and the other clergy, of whatever rank or order we may ſuppoſe them to be. It was therefore judged neceſſary, when the ſucceſs of LUTHER, and the progreſs of the Reformation, had effaced ſuch a conſiderable part of the majeſty of *Rome*, to found ſome new religious fraternity, that ſhould, in a particular manner, be devoted to the intereſts of the Roman pontif, and the very expreſs end of whoſe inſtitution ſhould be to renew the vigour of a declining hierarchy, to heal the deep wound it had received, to preſerve thoſe parts of the papal dominions that remained yet entire, and to augment them by new acceſſions. This was ſo much the more neceſſary, as the two famous *Mendicant* ſocieties [r], by whoſe miniſtry the popes had chiefly governed during many ages, and that with the greateſt ſucceſs and glory, had now loſt, on ſeveral accounts, a conſiderable part of their influence and authority, and were thereby leſs capable of ſerving the church with efficacy and vigour than they had formerly been. What the pontif ſought for, in this declining ſtate of his affairs, was found in that famous and moſt powerful ſociety, which, deriving its title from the name of JESUS, were commonly called *Jeſuits*, while they were ſtiled by their enemies *Loyalites*, and ſometimes *Inighiſts* [s], from the Spaniſh name of their founder [t]. This

---

☞ [r] Theſe two orders were the Franciſcans and the Dominicans.

☞ [s] The Spaniſh name of the founder of the order of Jeſuits was Don INIGO DE GUIPUSCOA.

[t] The writers who have given the moſt particular and circumſtantial accounts of the order of the Jeſuits, are enumerated by CHRISTOPH. AUG. SALIN. in his *Hiſtoria Auguſt. Confeſſionis*, tom. ii. p. 73.

founder was IGNATIUS LOYOLA, a Spaniſh knight, who, from an illiterate ſoldier, became an unparalleled fanatic; a fanatic, indeed, of a fertile and enterpriſing genius [*u*], who, after having paſſed through various ſcenes of life, came to *Rome*, and, being there directed by the prudent counſels of perſons much wiſer than himſelf, was rendered capable of inſtituting ſuch an order as the ſtate of the church at that time eſſentially required [*w*].

The nature of the order and inſtitution of the Jeſuits.

XI. The Jeſuits hold a middle rank between the *monks* and the *ſecular clerks*, and, with reſpect to the nature of their inſtitute, approach nearer to the *regular canons* than to any other order. For though

---

[*u*] Many Jeſuits have written the life of this extraordinary man; but the greateſt part of theſe biographers ſeem more intent on advancing the glory of their founder, than ſolicitous about the truth and fidelity of their relations; and hence the moſt common events, and the moſt trivial actions that concern IGNATIUS, are converted into prodigies and miracles. The hiſtory of this enterpriſing fanatic has been compoſed with equal truth and ingenuity, though ſeaſoned with a very large portion of wit and pleaſantry, by a French writer, who calls himſelf HERCULES RASIEL DE SELVE *. This work, which is divided into two volumes, is entitled, *Hiſtoire de l'admirable Don Inigo de Guipuſcoa, Chevalier de la Vierge, et fondateur de la Monarchie des Inighiſtes*, and it has paſſed already through two editions at the *Hague*.

[*w*] Not only the proteſtants, but alſo a great number of the more learned and judicious *Roman-catholics*, have unanimouſly denied, that IGNATIUS LOYOLA had either learning ſufficient to compoſe the writings of which he is ſaid to be the author, or genius enough to form the ſociety of which he is conſidered as the founder. They maintain, on the contrary, that he was no more than a flexible inſtrument, in the hands of able and ingenious men, who made uſe of his fortitude and fanaticiſm to anſwer their purpoſes; and that perſons much more learned than he were employed to compoſe the writings which bear his name. See GEDDES, *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, vol. iii. p. 429.—The greateſt part of his works are ſuppoſed to have proceeded from the pen of his ſecretary JOHN DE

☞ * This is a feigned name. The real author was Monſieur LE VIER, an ingenious bookſeller, who lived formerly at the *Hague*.

PALANÇO;

though they reſemble the monks in this, that they live ſeparate from the multitude, and are bound by certain religious vows, yet they are exempt from ſtated hours of worſhip, and other numerous and burthenſome ſervices, that lie heavy upon the Monaſtic orders, that they may have more time to employ in the education of youth, in directing the conſciences of the faithful, in edifying the church by their pious and learned productions, and in tranſacting other matters that relate to the proſperity of the papal hierarchy. Their whole order is divided into three claſſes. The firſt comprehends the *profeſſed members*, who live in what are called the *profeſſed houſes*; the ſecond contains the *ſcholars*, who inſtruct the youth in the *colleges*; and to the third belong the *novices*, who live in the *houſes of probation* [x]. The *profeſſed members*, beſides the three ordinary vows of *poverty*, *chaſtity*, and *obedience*, that are common to all the Monaſtic tribes, are obliged to take a fourth, by which they ſolemnly bind themſelves *to go, without deliberation or delay, wherever the pope ſhall think fit to ſend them*; they are alſo a kind of *Mendicants*, being without any fixed ſubſiſtence, and living upon the liberality of pious and well-diſpoſed people. The other *Jeſuits*, and more particu-

---

PALANCO; ſee LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme en Ethiopie*, p. 55. 271. The Benedictines affirm, that his book of *Spiritual Exerciſes* is copied from the work of a Spaniſh Benedictine monk, whoſe name was CISNEROS (ſee *La Vie de M. de la Croze, par* JORDAN), and the *Conſtitutions* of the *Society* were probably the work of LAINEZ and SALMERON, two learned men, who were among its firſt members. See *Hiſtoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. i. p. 115.

☞ (x) Other writers add a fourth claſs, conſiſting of the *Spiritual* and *Temporal Co-adjutors*, who aſſiſt the profeſſed members, and perform the ſame functions, without being bound by any more than the three *ſimple* vows; though, after a long and approved exerciſe of their employment, the *Spiritual Co-adjutors* are admitted to the *fourth* vow, and thus become *profeſſed members*.

larly the *ſcholars*, are poſſeſſed of large revenues, and are obliged, in caſe of urgent neceſſity, to contribute to the ſupport of the *profeſſed members.* Theſe latter, who are few in number (conſidering the multitudes that belong to the other claſſes), are, generally ſpeaking, men of prudence and learning, deeply ſkilled in the affairs of the world, and dexterous in tranſacting all kinds of buſineſs from long experience, added to their natural penetration and ſagacity; in a word, they are the *true* and *perfect* Jeſuits. The reſt have, indeed, the title, but are rather the companions and aſſiſtants of the *Jeſuits*, than real members of that myſterious order; and it is only in a very vague and general ſenſe, that the denomination of Jeſuits can be applied to them. But, what is ſtill more remarkable, the ſecrets of the ſociety are not revealed even to all the *profeſſed members.* It is only a ſmall number of this claſs, whom old age has enriched with thorough experience, and long trial declared worthy of ſuch an important truſt, that are inſtructed in the myſteries of the order.

The zeal of the Jeſuits for the intereſts of the Roman pontif.

XII. The church and court of *Rome*, ſince the remarkable period when ſo many kingdoms and provinces withdrew from their juriſdiction, have derived more influence and ſupport from the labours of this ſingle order, than from all their other emiſſaries and miniſters, and all the various exertions of their power and opulence. It was this famous company, which, ſpreading itſelf with an aſtoniſhing rapidity through the greateſt part of the habitable world, confirmed the wavering nations in the faith of *Rome*, reſtrained the progreſs of the riſing ſects, gained over a prodigious number of Pagans in the moſt barbarous and remote parts of the globe to the profeſſion of popery, and attacked the pretended heretics of all denominations; appearing almoſt alone in the field of controverſy, ſuſtaining with fortitude and reſolution the whole burthen of this religious war, and ſurpaſſing, by far, the champions of antiquity, both in the ſubtilty of their reaſonings and the eloquence of their diſcourſes. Nor is this all; for by the affected ſoftneſs and complying ſpirit that reigns in their converſation and manners, by their conſummate ſkill and prudence in civil tranſactions, by their acquaintance with the arts and ſciences, and a variety of other qualities and accompliſhments, they inſinuated themſelves into the peculiar favour and protection of ſtateſmen, perſons of the firſt diſtinction, and even of crowned heads. Nor did any thing contribute more to give them that aſcendency they have univerſally acquired, than the cunning and dexterity with which they relaxed and modified their ſyſtem of morality, accommodating it artfully to the propenſities of mankind, and depriving it, on certain occaſions, of that ſeverity, that rendered it burthenſome to the ſenſual and voluptuous. By this they ſupplanted, in the palaces of the great, and in the courts of princes, the Dominicans and other rigid doctors, who had formerly held there the tribunal of confeſſion and the direction of conſciences, and engroſſed to themſelves an excluſive and irreſiſtible influence in thoſe retreats of royal grandeur, from whence iſſue the counſels that govern mankind [*y*]. An order of this nature could not but be highly adapted to promote the intereſts of the court of *Rome*; and this, indeed, was its great end, and the leading purpoſe which it never loſt ſight of; employing every where its utmoſt vigilance and art to ſupport the authority of the Roman pontifs, and to ſave them from the contempt, of which they muſt have been naturally apprehenſive, in conſequence of a revolution that opened the eyes of a great part of mankind.

[*y*] Before the order of Jeſuits was inſtituted, the Dominicans alone directed the conſciences of all the European kings and princes. And it was by the Jeſuits that the Dominicans were deprived of a privilege ſo precious to ſpiritual ambition. See PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle de France*, livr. i. p. 322.

All theſe circumſtances placed the order of Jeſuits in a conſpicuous point of light. Their capacity, their influence, and their zeal for the papacy, had a very advantageous retroſpect upon themſelves, as it ſwelled the ſources of their opulence, and procured to their ſociety an uncommon, and indeed an exceſſive degree of veneration and reſpect. But it is alſo true, that theſe ſignal honours and advantages expoſed them, at the ſame time, to the envy of other religious orders; that their enemies multiplied from day to day; and that they were often involved in the greateſt perplexities and perils. Monks, courtiers, civil magiſtrates, public ſchools, united their efforts to cruſh this riſing fabric of ambition and policy; and a prodigious number of books were publiſhed to prove, that nothing could be more detrimental to the intereſts of religion, and the well-being of ſociety, than the inſtitution of the Jeſuits. In *France*, *Poland*, and other countries, they were declared public enemies of their country, traitors and parricides, and were even baniſhed with ignominy [z]. But the prudence, or rather the cunning and artifice, of the diſciples of *Loyola*, calmed this ſtorm of oppoſition, and, by gentle and imperceptible methods, reſtored the credit and authority of their order, delivered it from the perils with which it had been threatened, and even put it in a ſtate of defence againſt the future attempts of its adverſaries [a].

---

[z] See the *Hiſtoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iii. paſſim.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. vi. p. 559—648, et paſſim.—As well as almoſt all the writers who have given accounts of the ſixteenth century.

Roman pontifs.

XIII. The pontifs of this century that ruled the church after the deceaſe of ALEXANDER VI., were PIUS III., JULIUS II. [b], LEO X.,

---

☞ [a] The character and ſpirit of the Jeſuits were admirably deſcribed, and their tranſactions and fate foretold, with a ſagacity almoſt prophetic, ſo early as the year 1551, in a ſermon preached in *Chriſt-Church, Dublin*, by Dr. GEORGE BROWN, biſhop of that ſee; a copy of which was given to Sir JAMES WARE; and may be found in the *Harleian Miſcellany* (vol. v. p. 566.). The remarkable paſſage that relates to the Jeſuits is as follows: “ But there are a new fraternity of late ſprung up, who call themſelves *Jeſuits*, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes and Phariſees' manner. Amongſt the *Jews* they ſhall ſtrive to aboliſh the truth, and ſhall come very near to do it. For theſe ſorts will turn themſelves into ſeveral forms; with the Heathens a Heatheniſt, with the Atheiſts an Atheiſt, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purpoſely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at laſt to be like the fool that *ſaid, in his heart, there was no God.* Theſe ſhall ſpread over the whole world, *ſhall be admitted into the councils of princes, and they never the wiſer*; charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the ſecrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, by neglect of fulfilling the law of God, and by winking at their ſins; yet, in the end, God, to juſtify his law, *ſhall ſuddenly cut off this ſociety, even* by the hands of thoſe who *have moſt ſuccoured them*, and *made uſe of them*; ſo that, at the end, they ſhall become *odious to all nations*. They ſhall be worſe than *Jews*, having no reſting-place upon earth, and then ſhall a Jew have more favour than a *Jeſuit*.”—This ſingular paſſage, I had almoſt ſaid prediction, ſeems to be accompliſhed in part, by the preſent ſuppreſſion of the Jeſuits in *France (I write this note in the year* 1762); and by the univerſal indignation which the perfidious ſtratagems, iniquitous avarice, and ambitious views of that ſociety, have excited among all the orders of the French nation, from the throne to the cottage.

☞ [b] It was from a fooliſh ambition of reſembling CÆSAR (a very ſingular model for a Chriſtian pontif), that this pope, whoſe name was ROVERE, aſſumed the denomination of JULIUS II. It may be indeed ſaid, that CÆSAR was ſovereign pontif (*pontifex maximus*), and that the pope of *Rome* enjoyed the ſame dignity, though with ſome change in the title.

Adrian VI., whoſe characters and tranſactions have been already taken notice of; Clement VII., of the houſe of Medicis,—Paul III., of the illuſtrious family of Farnese [*c*], Julius III. [*d*], whoſe name was John Maria Giocci,—Marcellus II.,—Paul IV. [*e*], whoſe name, before his

---

[*c*] The ſentiments and character of Paul III. have given riſe to much debate, even in our time, eſpecially between the late Cardinal Quirini, and Keisling, Schelhorn, and ſome other writers. The cardinal has uſed his utmoſt efforts to defend the probity and merit of this pontif; while the two learned men above-mentioned repreſent him as a perfidious politician, whoſe predominant qualities were diſſimulation and fraud. See Quirinus, *De geſtis* Pauli III., *Farneſii Brixiæ*, 1745, in 4to. ☞ Among the *res geſtæ* of Paul III. were two baſtards, whoſe offspring, Farnese and Sforza, were made cardinals in their infancy. See Keislingii *Epiſt. de geſtis* Pauli III. Schelhorn. *Amœnitates Hiſt. Eccleſ. et Liter.* But the licentious exploits of this pope do not end here. He was reproached, in a book publiſhed before his death under the name of Ochino, with having poiſoned his mother and his nephew, with having raviſhed a young virgin at *Ancona*, with an inceſtuous and adulterous commerce with his daughter Constantia, who died of poiſon adminiſtered by the pope, to prevent any interruption in his odious amours. It is ſaid, in the ſame book, that being caught in bed with his niece Laura Farnese, who was the wife of Nic. Quercei, he received from this incenſed huſband a ſtab of a dagger, of which he bore the marks to his death. See Skeidan, *Comment. de Statu Relig. et Republicæ, Carolo Quinto Cæſare*, lib. xxi, p. 667. edit. *Argentor.*

☞ [*d*] This was the worthy pontif, who was ſcarcely ſeated in the papal chair, when he beſtowed the cardinal's hat on the keeper of his monkeys, a boy choſen from among the loweſt of the populace, and who was alſo the infamous object of his unnatural pleaſures. See Thuan. lib. vi. & xv.—Hoffing. *Hiſt. Eccl.* tom. v. p. 572.—and more eſpecially Sleidan, *Hiſtor.* lib. xxi. *Folio,* m. 609.—When Julius was reproached by the cardinals for introducing ſuch an unworthy member into the ſacred college, a perſon who had neither learning, nor virtue, nor merit of any kind, he impudently replied by aſking them, *What virtue or merit they had found in him, that could induce them to place him* (Julius) *in the papal chair?*

☞ [*e*] Nothing could exceed the arrogance and ambition of this violent and impetuous pontif, as appears from his treatment his elevation to the pontificate, was JOHN PETER CARAFFA,—Pius IV., who was ambitious of being looked upon as a branch of the houſe of MEDICIS, and who had been known, before his promotion, by the name of JOHN ANGELI DE MEDICIS,—Pius V., a Dominican, called MICHAEL GHISLERI, a man of an auſtere and melancholy turn of mind, by which, and other ſimilar qualities, he obtained a place in the Kalendar,—GREGORY XIII., who was known previouſly by the name of HUGO BUONCOMPAGNO [f],—SIXTUS V., otherwiſe named FELIX PERETTI DI MONTALTO, who, in pride, magnificence, intrepidity, and ſtrength of mind, and in other great virtues and vices, ſurpaſſed by far all his predeceſſors,—URBAN VIII. GREGORY XIV., INNOCENT IX., the ſhortneſs of whoſe reigns prevented them from acquiring reputation, or falling into reproach.

Among theſe pontifs there were better and worſe [g]; but they were all men of exemplary characters,

---

treatment of Queen ELIZABETH. See BURNET's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*.—It was he, who by a bull, pretended to raiſe *Ireland* to the privilege and quality of an independent kingdom; and it was he alſo who firſt inſtituted the *Index of prohibited books*, mentioned above § IX.

[f] See JO. PETR. MAFFEI *Annales Gregorii* XIII., *Rom.* 1742, in 4to.

[g] PIUS V. and SIXTUS V. made a much greater figure in the Annals of Fame, than the other pontifs here mentioned; the former on account of his exceſſive ſeverity againſt heretics, and the famous bull *In Cœna Domini*, which is read publicly at *Rome* every year on the *Feſtival of the Holy Sacrament*; and the latter, in conſequence of many ſervices rendered to the church, and numberleſs attempts, carried on with ſpirit, fortitude, generoſity, and perſeverance, to promote its glory and maintain its authority.—Several modern writers employed their pens in deſcribing the life and actions of PIUS V., ſo ſoon as they ſaw him canoniſed, in the year 1712, by CLEMENT XI. Of his bull, entitled, *In Cœna Domini*, and the tumults it occaſioned, there is an ample account in GIANNONE's *Hiſtoire Civile de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 248. The life of SIXTUS V. has been written by GREGORY LETI, and tranſlated

characters, when compared with the greateſt part of thoſe who governed the church before the Reformation. The number of adverſaries, both foreign and domeſtic, that aroſe to ſet limits to the deſpotiſm of *Rome*, and to call in queſtion the authority and juriſdiction of its pontif, rendered the college of cardinals, and the Roman nobility, more cautious and circumſpect in the choice of a ſpiritual ruler; nor did they almoſt dare, in theſe critical circumſtances of oppoſition and danger, to entruſt ſuch an important dignity to any eccleſiaſtic, whoſe bare-faced licentiouſneſs, frontleſs arrogance, or inconſiderate youth, might render him peculiarly obnoxious to reproach, and furniſh thereby new matter of cenſure to their adverſaries. It is alſo worthy of obſervation, that from this period of oppoſition, occaſioned by the miniſtry of the reformers, the Roman pontifs have never pretended to ſuch an excluſive authority, as they had formerly uſurped; nor could they, indeed, make good ſuch pretenſions, were they ſo extravagant as to avow them. They claim, therefore, no longer a power of deciding, by their ſingle authority, matters of the higheſt moment and importance; but, for the moſt part, pronounce according to the ſentiments that prevail in the college of cardinals, and in the different congregations, which are intruſted with their reſpective parts in the government of the church. Nor do they any more venture to foment diviſions in ſovereign ſtates, to arm ſubjects againſt their rulers, or to level the thunder of their excommunications at the heads of princes. All ſuch proceedings, which were formerly ſo frequent at the court of *Rome*, have been prudently ſuſpended ſince the

---

tranſlated into ſeveral languages; it is however a very indifferent work, and the relations it contains are, in many places, inaccurate and unfaithful.

gradual decline of that ignorance and ſuperſtition that preſcribed a blind obedience to the pontif, and the new degrees of power and authority that monarchs and other civil rulers have gained by the revolutions that have ſhaken the papal throne.

The ſtate of the clergy.

XIV. That part of the body of the clergy, that is more peculiarly devoted to the Roman pontifs, ſeemed to have undergone no viſible change during this century. As to the biſhops, it is certain that they made ſeveral zealous attempts, and ſome even in the council of *Trent*, for the recovery of the ancient rights and privileges, of which they had been forcibly deprived by the popes. They were even perſuaded that the pope might be lawfully obliged to acknowledge, that the epiſcopal dignity was of divine original, and that the biſhops received their authority immediately from CHRIST himſelf [*b*]. But all theſe attempts were ſucceſsfully oppoſed by the artifice and dexterity of the court of *Rome*, which never ceaſes to propagate and enforce this deſpotic maxim: "That the biſhops are no more than the legates "or miniſters of Chriſt's vicar; and that the authority they exerciſe is entirely derived from "the munificence and *favour of the apoſtolic ſee*:" a maxim, however, that ſeveral biſhops, and more eſpecially thoſe of *France*, treat with little reſpect. Some advantages, however, and thoſe not inconſiderable, were obtained for the clergy at the expence of the pontifs; for thoſe *reſervations*, *proviſions*, *exemptions*, and *expectatives* (as they are termed by the Roman lawyers), which before the Reformation had excited ſuch heavy and bitter complaints throughout all *Europe*, and exhibited the cleareſt proofs of papal avarice and tyranny, were now almoſt totally ſuppreſſed.

[*b*] See PAOLO SARPI's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent.*

The lives and morals of the clergy.

XV. Among the ſubjects of deliberation in the council of *Trent*, the reformation of the lives and manners of the clergy, and the ſuppreſſion of the ſcandalous vices that had too long reigned in that order, were not forgot; nay, ſeveral wiſe and prudent laws were enacted with a view to that important object. But thoſe who had the cauſe of virtue at heart, complained (and the reaſon of theſe complaints ſtill ſubſiſts) that theſe laws were no more than feeble precepts, without any avenging arm to maintain their authority; and that they were tranſgreſſed, with impunity, by the clergy of all ranks, and particularly by thoſe who filled the higheſt ſtations and dignities of the church. In reality, if we caſt our eyes upon the Romiſh clergy, even in the preſent time, theſe complaints will appear as well founded now, as they were in the ſixteenth century. In *Germany*, as is notorious to daily obſervation, the biſhops, if we except their habit, their title, and a few ceremonies that diſtinguiſh them, have nothing in their manner of living that is, in the leaſt, adapted to point out the nature of their ſacred office. In other countries, a great part of the epiſcopal order, unmoleſted by the remonſtrances or reproofs of the Roman pontif, paſs their days amidſt the pleaſures and cabals of courts, and appear rather the ſlaves of temporal princes, than the ſervants of Him *whoſe kingdom is not of this world.* They court glory; they aſpire after riches, while very few employ their time and labours in edifying their people, or in promoting among them the vital ſpirit of practical religion and ſubſtantial virtue. Nay, what is ſtill more deplorable, thoſe biſhops, who, ſenſible of the ſanctity of their character and the duties of their office, diſtinguiſh themſelves by their zeal in the cauſe of virtue and good morals, are frequently expoſed to the malicious efforts of envy, often loaded with falſe accuſations, and involved in perplexities of various kinds. It may, indeed, be partly owing to the examples they have received, and ſtill too often receive, from the heads of the church, that ſo many of the biſhops live diſſolved in the arms of luxury, or toiling in the ſervice of ambition. Many of them, perhaps, would have been more attentive to their vocation, and more exemplary in their manners, had they not been corrupted by the models exhibited to them by the biſhops of *Rome*, and had conſtantly before their eyes a ſplendid ſucceſſion of popes and cardinals, remarkable only for their luxury and avarice, their arrogance and vindictive ſpirit, their voluptuouſneſs and vanity.

That part of the clergy that go under the denomination of *canons*, continue, almoſt every where, their ancient courſe of life, and conſume, in a manner far remote from piety and virtue, the treaſures which the religious zeal, and liberality of their anceſtors, had conſecrated to the uſes of the church, and the relief of the poor.

It muſt not, however, be imagined, that all the other orders of the clergy are at liberty to follow ſuch corrupt models, or, indeed, that their inclinations and reigning habits tend towards ſuch a looſe and voluptuous manner of living. For it is certain, that the Reformation had a manifeſt influence even upon the Roman-catholic clergy, by rendering them, at leaſt, more circumſpect and cautious in their external conduct, that they might be thus leſs obnoxious to the cenſures of their adverſaries; and it is accordingly well known, that ſince that period the clergy of the inferior orders have been more attentive to the rules of outward decency, and have given leſs offence by open and ſcandalous vices and exceſſes, than they had formerly done.

XVI. The

Monks—The ancient orders reformed.

XVI. The ſame obſervation holds good with reſpect to the Monaſtic orders. There are, indeed, ſeveral things, worthy of the ſevereſt animadverſion, chargeable upon many of the heads and rulers of theſe ſocieties; nor are theſe ſocieties themſelves entirely exempt from that lazineſs, intemperance, ignorance, artifice, diſcord, and voluptuouſneſs, that were formerly the common and reigning vices in the Monaſtic retreats. It would be, nevertheleſs, an inſtance of great partiality and injuſtice to deny, that in many countries the manner of living, among theſe religious orders, has been conſiderably reformed, ſevere rules employed to reſtrain licentiouſneſs, and much pains taken to conceal, at leaſt, any veſtiges of ancient corruption and irregularity that may yet remain. In ſome places, the auſterity of the ancient rules of diſcipline, which had been ſo ſhamefully relaxed, was reſtored by ſeveral zealous patrons of Monaſtic devotion; while others, animated with the ſame zeal, inſtituted new communities, in order to promote, as they piouſly imagined, a ſpirit of religion, and thus to contribute to the well-being of the church.

Of this latter number was MATTHEW DE BASSI, a native of *Italy*, the extent of whoſe capacity was much inferior to the goodneſs of his intentions, and who was a Franciſcan of the more rigid claſs [i], who were zealous in *obſerving* rigorouſly the primitive rules of their inſtitution. This honeſt enthuſiaſt ſeriouſly perſuaded himſelf, that

---

☞ [i] The diſpute that aroſe among the Franciſcans by INNOCENT IV.'s relaxing ſo far their *inſtitute* as to allow of *property* and *poſſeſſions* in their community, produced a diviſion of the order into two claſſes, of which the moſt conſiderable, who adopted the papal relaxation, were denominated *Conventuals*, and the other, who rejected it, *Brethren of the Obſervance*. The latter profeſſed to *obſerve* and follow rigorouſly the primitive laws and inſtitute of their founder.

he was divinely inſpired with the zeal that impelled him to reſtore the original and genuine rules of the Franciſcan order to their primitive auſterity; and, looking upon this violent and irreſiſtible impulſe as a celeſtial commiſſion, attended with ſufficient authority, he ſet himſelf to this work of Monaſtic reformation with the moſt devout aſſiduity and ardour [*k*]. His enterprize was honoured, in the year 1525, with the ſolemn approbation of CLEMENT VII.; and this was the origin of the order of *Capuchins*. The vows of this order implied the greateſt contempt of the world and its enjoyments, and the moſt profound humility, accompanied with the moſt auſtere and ſullen gravity of external aſpect [*l*]; and its reputation and ſucceſs excited, in the other Franciſcans, the moſt bitter feelings of indignation and envy [*m*]. The *Capuchins* were ſo called from the ſharp-pointed *Capuche*, or Cowl [*n*], which they added to the ordinary Franciſcan habit, and

---

☞ [*k*] The *Brethren of the Obſervance*, mentioned in the preceding note, had degenerated, in proceſs of time, from their primitive ſelf-denial; and hence the reforming ſpirit, that animated BASSI.

[*l*] See LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Ordinis Minorum*, tom. xvi. p. 207. 257. edit. *Roman.*—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres Monaſtiques*, tom. vii. ch. xxiv. p. 264.—And, above all, ZACH. BOVERII *Annales Capuchinorum*.

☞ [*m*] One of the circumſtances that exaſperated moſt the Franciſcans, was the innovation made in their habit by the *Capuchins*. Whatever was the cauſe of their choler, true it is, that their provincial perſecuted the new monks, and obliged them to fly from place to place, until they at laſt took refuge in the palace of the duke of *Camerino*, by whoſe credit they were received under the obedience of the *Conventuals*, in the quality of *hermits minors*, in the year 1527. The next year the pope approved this union, and confirmed to them the privilege of wearing the ſquare *capuche*; and thus the order was eſtabliſhed in 1528.

☞ [*n*] I know not on what authority the learned MICHAEL GEDDES attributes the erection and denomination of this order to one FRANCIS PUCHINE.

which is ſuppoſed to have been uſed by St. FRANCIS himſelf, as a covering for his head [*o*].

Another branch of the Franciſcan order formed a new community, under the denomination of *Recollets* in *France*, *Reformed Franciſcans* in *Italy*, and *Bare-footed Franciſcans* in *Spain*, and were erected into a ſeparate order, with their reſpective laws and rules of diſcipline, in the year 1532, by the authority of CLEMENT VII. They differ from the other Franciſcans in this only, that they profeſs to follow, with greater zeal and exactneſs, the auſtere inſtitute of their common founder and chief; and hence alſo they were called *Friars Minors of the ſtrict obſervance* [*p*].

St. THERESA, a Spaniſh lady of an illuſtrious family, undertook the difficult taſk of reforming the Carmelite order [*q*], which had departed much from its primitive ſanctity, and of reſtoring its neglected and violated laws to their original credit and authority. Her aſſociate, in this arduous attempt, was JOHANNES DE SANTA CRUSA, and her enterprize was not wholly deſtitute of ſucceſs, notwithſtanding the oppoſition ſhe met with from the greateſt part of the *Carmelites*. Hence the order was, during the ſpace of ten years, divided into two branches, of which one followed a milder rule of diſcipline, while the other embraced an inſtitute of the moſt ſevere and ſelf-denying kind [*r*]. But, as theſe different rules of life among the members of the ſame community were a perpetual ſource of animoſity and diſcord, the more auſtere, or *bare-footed* Carmelites, were ſeparated from the others, and formed into a diſtinct body, in the year 1580, by GREGORY XIII., at the particular deſire of PHILIP II., king of *Spain.* This ſeparation was confirmed, in the year 1587, by SIXTUS V., and completed, in 1593, by CLEMENT VIII., who allowed the *bare-footed Carmelites* to have their own chief, or *general.* But, after having withdrawn themſelves from the others, theſe auſtere friars quarrelled among themſelves, and in a few years their diſſenſions grew to an intolerable height; hence they were divided anew, by the pontif laſt mentioned, into two communities, each of which were governed by their reſpect *general* [s].

[*o*] See DU FRESNE *Gloſſarium Latinitat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 298. edit. *Benedict.*

[*p*] See WADDINGI *Annales*, tom. xvi. p. 167.—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres Monaſt.* tom. vii. ch. xviii. p. 129.

[*q*] Otherwiſe called the *White Fryars.*

☞ [*r*] The former, who were the Carmelites *of the ancient obſervance*, were called the *moderate* or *mitigated*; while the latter, who were of the *ſtrict obſervance*, were diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of *bare-footed Carmelites.*

New Monaſtic orders.

XVII. The moſt eminent of all the new orders that were inſtituted in this century, was, beyond all doubt, that of the *Jeſuits,* which we have already had occaſion to mention, in ſpeaking of the chief pillars of the church of *Rome,* and the principal ſupports of the declining authority of its pontifs. Compared with this aſpiring and formidable ſociety, all the other religious orders appear inconſiderable and obſcure. The Reformation, among the other changes which it occaſioned, even in the Roman church, by exciting the circumſpection and emulation of thoſe who ſtill remained addicted to popery, gave riſe to various communities, which were all comprehended under the general denomination of *Regular Clerks.* And as all theſe communities were, according to their own ſolemn declarations, formed with a deſign of imitating that ſanctity of manners, and reviving that ſpirit of piety and virtue, that had diſtinguiſhed the ſacred order in the primitive times; this was a plain, though tacit confeſſion of the preſent corruption of the clergy, and conſequently of the indiſpenſable neceſſity of the Reformation.

---

[s] HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres,* tom. i. ch. xlvii. p. 340.

The firſt ſociety of theſe regular clerks was formed in the year 1524, under the denomination of *Theatins*, which they derived from their principal founder JOHN PETER CARAFFA (then biſhop of *Theate*, or *Chieti*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, and afterwards pope, under the title of PAUL IV.), who was aſſiſted in this pious undertaking by CAJETAN, or GAETAN, and other devout aſſociates. Theſe monks, being by their vows deſtitute of all poſſeſſions and revenues, and even ſecluded from the reſource of begging, ſubſiſt entirely upon the voluntary liberality of pious perſons. They are called by their profeſſion and inſtitute to revive a ſpirit of devotion, to purify and reform the eloquence of the pulpit, to aſſiſt the ſick and the dying by their ſpiritual inſtructions and counſels, and to combat heretics of all denominations with zeal and aſſiduity [*t*]. There are alſo ſome female convents eſtabliſhed under the rule and title of this order.

The eſtabliſhment of the *Theatins* was followed by that of the *Regular Clerks of St. Paul*, ſo called from their having choſen that apoſtle for their patron; though they are more commonly known under the denomination of *Barnabites*, from the church of St. *Barnabas*, at *Milan*, which was beſtowed upon them in the year 1545. This order, which was approved by CLEMENT VII., and confirmed about three years after by PAUL III., was originally founded by ANTONIO MAVIA ZACHARIAS of *Cremona*, and BARTHOLOMEW FERRARI, and JACOB. ANT. MORIGIA, noblemen of *Milan*. Its members were at firſt obliged to live after the manner of the *Theatins*, renouncing all worldly goods and poſſeſſions, and depending upon the ſpontaneous donations of the liberal for their daily ſubſiſtence. But they grew ſoon weary of this precarious method of living from hand to mouth, and therefore took the liberty, in proceſs of time, of ſecuring to their community certain poſſeſſions and ſtated revenues. Their principal function is to go from place to place, like the apoſtles, in order to convert ſinners, and bring back tranſgreſſors into the paths of repentance and obedience [*u*].

[*t*] HELYOT, *ibid.* tom. iv. ch. xii. p. 71.

The *Regular Clerks of St. Maieul,* who are alſo called *the fathers of Somaſquo,* from the place where their community was firſt eſtabliſhed, and which was alſo the reſidence of their founder, were erected into a diſtinct ſociety by JEROME ÆMILIANI, a noble Venetian, and were afterwards ſucceſſively confirmed, in the years 1540 and 1563, by the Roman pontifs PAUL III. and PIUS IV. [*w*]. Their chief occupation was to inſtruct the ignorant, and particularly young perſons, in the principles and precepts of the Chriſtian religion, and to procure aſſiſtance for thoſe that were reduced to the unhappy condition of orphans. The ſame important miniſtry was committed to the *Fathers of the Chriſtian doctrine* in *France* and *Italy.* The order that bore this title in *France* was inſtituted by CÆSAR DE BUS, and confirmed, in the year 1597, by CLEMENT VIII.; while that which is known in *Italy* under the ſame denomination, derives its origin from MARK CUSANI, a Milaneſe knight, and was eſtabliſhed by the approbation and authority of PIUS V. and GREGORY XIII.

[*u*] HELYOT, *loc. cit.* tom. iv. ch. xvi. p. 100.—In the ſame part of this incomparable work, this learned author gives a moſt accurate, ample, and intereſting account of the other religious orders, which are here, for brevity's ſake, but barely mentioned.

[*w*] *Acta Sanctor. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 217.

XVIII. It

Other new religious communities.

XVIII. It would be an endleſs, and, indeed, an unprofitable labour to enumerate particularly that prodigious multitude of leſs conſiderable orders and religious aſſociations, that were inſtituted in *Germany* and other countries, from an apprehenſion of the pretended heretics, who diſturbed by their innovations the peace, or rather the lethargy, of the church. For certainly no age produced ſuch a ſwarm of monks, and ſuch a number of convents, as that in which LUTHER and the other reformers oppoſed the divine light and power of the goſpel to ignorance, ſuperſtition, and papal tyranny. We therefore paſs over in ſilence theſe leſs important eſtabliſhments, of which many have been long buried in oblivion, becauſe they were erected on unſtable foundations, while numbers have been ſuppreſſed by the wiſdom of certain pontifs, who have conſidered the multitude of theſe communities rather as prejudicial than advantageous to the church. Nor can we take particular notice of the female convents, or nunneries, among which the *Urſulines* ſhine forth with a ſuperior luſtre both in point of number and dignity. The *Prieſts of the Oratory*, founded in *Italy* by PHILIP NERI, a native of *Florence*, and publicly honoured with the protection of GREGORY XIII., in the year 1577, muſt, however, be excepted from this general ſilence, on account of the eminent figure they have made in the republic of letters. It was this community that produced BARONIUS, RAYNALDUS, and LADERCHIUS, who hold ſo high a rank among the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians of the ſixteenth and following centuries; and there are ſtill to be found in it men of conſiderable erudition and capacity. The name of this religious ſociety was derived from an apartment, accommodated in the form of an *Orato-*

ry [x], or cabinet for devotion, which St. PHILIP NERI built at *Florence* for himſelf, and in which, for many years, he held ſpiritual conferences with his more intimate companions [y].

The ſtate of learning.

XIX. It is too evident to admit of the leaſt diſpute, that all kinds of erudition, whether ſacred or profane, were held in much higher eſteem in the weſtern world ſince the time of LUTHER, than they had been before that auſpicious period. The Jeſuits, more eſpecially, boaſt, and perhaps not without reaſon, that their ſociety contributed more, at leaſt in this century, to the culture of the languages, the improvement of the arts, and the advancement of true ſcience, than all the reſt of the religious orders. It is certain, that the ſchools and academies, either through indolence or deſign, perſiſted obſtinately in their ancient method of teaching, though that method was intricate and diſagreeable in many reſpects; nor would they ſuffer themſelves to be better informed, or permit the leaſt change in their uncouth and diſguſting ſyſtems. The monks were not more remarkable for their docility than the ſchools; nor did they ſeem at all diſpoſed to admit into the retreats of their gloomy cloiſters, a more ſolid and elegant method of inſtruction than they had been formerly accuſtomed to. Theſe facts furniſh a rational account of the ſurpriſing variety that appears in the *ſtyle* and *manner* of the writers of this age, of whom ſeveral expreſs their ſentiments with elegance, perſpicuity, and order, while the diction of a great part of their contemporaries is barbarous, perplexed, obſcure, and inſipid.

---

[x] HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, &c. tom. viii. ch. iv. p. 12.

☞ [y] He was peculiarly aſſiſted in theſe conferences by BARONIUS, author of the *Eccleſiaſtical Annals*, who alſo ſucceeded him as general of the order, and whoſe *Annals*, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, are ſo remarkably full of groſs faults, miſrepreſentations, and blunders.

CÆSAR BARONIUS, already mentioned, undertook to throw light on the hiſtory of religion by his annals of the Chriſtian church; but this pretended light was ſcarcely any thing better than perplexity and darkneſs [z]. His example, however, excited many to enterprizes of the ſame nature. The attempts of the perſons they called heretics, rendered indeed ſuch enterprizes neceſſary: for theſe heretics, with the learned FLACKIUS and CHEMNITZ at their head [a], demonſtrated with the utmoſt evidence, that not only the declarations of holy ſcripture, but alſo the teſtimony of ancient hiſtory, and the records of the primitive church, were in direct oppoſition both to the doctrines and pretenſions of the church of *Rome.* This was wounding popery with its own arms, and attacking it in its pretended ſtrong holds. It was, therefore, incumbent upon the friends of *Rome* to employ, while it was time, their moſt zealous efforts in maintaining the credit of thoſe ancient fables, on which the greateſt part of the papal authority repoſed, as its only foundation and ſupport.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

XX. Several men of genius in *France* and *Italy*, who have been already mentioned with the eſteem that is due to their valuable labours [b], uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to reform the barbarous philoſophy of the times. But the exceſſive attachment of the ſcholaſtic doctors to the Ariſtotelian philoſophy on the one hand, and, on the other, the timorous prudence of many weak minds, who were apprehenſive that the liberty of ſtriking out new diſcoveries and ways of thinking might be prejudicial to the church, and open a new ſource of diviſion and diſcord, cruſhed all theſe generous endeavours, and rendered them ineffectual. The throne of the ſubtile Stagirite remained therefore unſhaken; and his philoſophy, whoſe very obſcurity afforded a certain gloomy kind of pleaſure, and flattered the pride of thoſe who were implicitly ſuppoſed to underſtand it, reigned unrivalled in the ſchools and monaſteries. It even acquired new credit and authority from the Jeſuits, who taught it in their colleges, and made uſe of it in their writings and diſputes. By this, however, theſe artful eccleſiaſtics ſhewed evidently, that the captious jargon and ſubtilties of that intricate philoſophy were much more adapted to puzzle heretics, and to give the popiſh doctors at leaſt the appearance of carrying on the controverſy with ſucceſs, than the plain and obvious method of diſputing, which is pointed out by the genuine and unbiaſſed dictates of right reaſon.

---

[z] The learned ISAAC CASAUBON undertook a refutation of the *Annals* of BARONIUS, in an excellent work, entitled, *Exercitationes*, &c. and though he carried it no farther down than the 34th year of the Chriſtian æra, yet he pointed out a prodigious number of palpable, and (many of them) ſhameful errors, into which the Romiſh annaliſt has fallen during that ſhort ſpace. Even the Roman-catholic *literati* acknowledge the inaccuracies and faults of BARONIUS; hence many learned men, ſuch as PAGI, NORIS, and TILLEMONT, have been employed to correct them, And accordingly, a few years ago, a new edition of theſe *Annals* was publiſhed at *Lucca*, with the corrections of theſe reviewers at the foot of each page.

[a] The former in the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes*; the latter in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini.*

[b] See above, Sect. II. VIII. and IX.

Theological writers of the Romiſh perſuaſion.

XXI. The church of *Rome* produced, in this century, a prodigious number of theological writers. The moſt eminent of theſe, both in point of reputation and merit, are as follow: THOMAS DE VIO, otherwiſe named Cardinal CAJETAN,—ECKIUS,—COCHLÆUS,—EMSER,—SURIUS,—HOSIUS,—FABER,—SADOLET,—PIGHIUS,—VATABLE,—CANUS,—D'ESPENCE,—CARANZA—MALDONAT,—TURRIANUS,—ARIAS MONTANUS,—CATHARINUS,—REGINALD POLE,—SIXTUS SENENSIS,—

NENSIS,—CASSANDER,—PAYA D'ANDRADA,—BAIUS,—PAMELIUS, and others [*c*].

The principles of the Roman-catholic faith.

XXII. The religion of *Rome*, which the pontifs are ſo deſirous of impoſing upon the faith of all that bear the Chriſtian name, is derived, according to the unanimous accounts of its doctors, from two ſources, the *written word of God*, and the *unwritten*; or, in other words, from *ſcripture* and *tradition*. But as the moſt eminent divines of that church are far from being agreed concerning the perſon or perſons who are authoriſed to interpret the declarations of theſe two oracles, and to determine their ſenſe; ſo it may be aſſerted with truth, that there is, as yet, no poſſibility of knowing with certainty what are the real doctrines of the church of *Rome*, nor where, in that communion, the judge of religious controverſies is to be found. It is true, in the court of *Rome*, and all thoſe who favour the deſpotic pretenſions of its pontif, maintain that he alone, who governs the church as CHRIST's vicegerent, is entitled to explain and determine the ſenſe of *ſcripture* and *tradition* in matters pertaining to ſalvation, and that, of conſequence, a devout and unlimited obedience is due to his deciſions. To give weight to this opinion, PIUS IV. formed the plan of a council, which was afterwards inſtituted and confirmed by SIXTUS V., and called the *Congregation for interpreting the decrees of the council of Trent*. This congregation was authoriſed to examine and decide, in the name of the pope, all matters of ſmall moment relating to eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, while every debate of any conſequence, and particularly all diſquiſitions concerning points of faith and doctrine, were left to the deciſion of the pontif alone, as the great oracle of the church [*d*]. But notwithſtanding all this, it was impoſſible to perſuade the wiſer part of the Roman-catholic body to acknowledge this excluſive authority in their head. And accordingly, the greateſt part of the Gallican church, and a conſiderable number of very learned men of the popiſh religion in other countries, think very differently from the court of *Rome* on this ſubject. They maintain, that all biſhops and doctors have a right to conſult the ſacred fountains of *ſcripture* and *tradition*, and to draw from thence the rules of faith and manners for themſelves and their flock; and that all difficult points and debates of conſequence are to be referred to the cognizance and deciſion of general councils. Such is the difference of opinion (with reſpect to the determination of doctrine and controverſies) that ſtill divides the church of *Rome*; and as no judge has been, nor perhaps can be, found to compoſe it, we may therefore reaſonably deſpair of ſeeing the religion of *Rome* acquire a permanent, ſtable, and determined form.

[*c*] For an ample account of the literary character, rank, and writings of theſe learned men, and of ſeveral others whoſe names are here omitted, ſee LOUIS ELL. DU PIN, *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, tom. xiv and xvi.

The council of *Trent.*

XXIII. The council of *Trent* was aſſembled, as was pretended, to correct, illuſtrate, and fix with perſpicuity, the doctrine of the church, to reſtore the vigour of its diſcipline, and to reform the lives of its miniſters. But in the opinion of thoſe who examine things with impartiality, this aſſembly, inſtead of reforming ancient abuſes, rather gave riſe to new enormities; and many tranſactions of this council have excited the juſt complaints of the wiſeſt men in both communions.

[*d*] See AYMON, *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*. part V. ch. iv. p. 282. ☞ Hence it was, that the approbation of INNOCENT XI. was refuſed to the artful and inſiduous work of BOSSUET, biſhop of *Meaux*, entitled, *An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, until the author had ſuppreſſed entirely the firſt edition of that work, and made corrections and alterations in the ſecond.

They complain that many of the opinions of the ſcholaſtic doctors on intricate points (that had formerly been left undecided, and had been wiſely permited as ſubjects of free debate) were, by this council, abſurdly adopted as articles of faith, and recommended as ſuch, nay impoſed, with violence, upon the conſciences of the people, under pain of excommunication. They complain of the ambiguity that reigns in the decrees and declarations of that council, by which the diſputes and diſſenſions that had formerly rent the church, inſtead of being removed by clear definitions and wiſe and charitable deciſions, were rendered, on the contrary, more perplexed and intricate, and were, in reality, propagated and multiplied inſtead of being ſuppreſſed or diminiſhed. Nor were theſe the only reaſons of complaint; for it muſt have been afflicting to thoſe that had the cauſe of true religion and Chriſtian liberty at heart, to ſee all things decided, in that aſſembly, according to the deſpotic will of the Roman pontif, without any regard to the dictates of truth, or the authority of ſcripture, its genuine and authentic ſource, and to ſee the aſſembled fathers reduced to ſilence by the Roman legates, and deprived, by theſe inſolent repreſentatives of the papacy, of that influence and credit, that might have rendered them capable of healing the wounds of the church. It was moreover a grievance juſtly to be complained of, that the few wiſe and pious regulations, that were made in that council, were never ſupported by the authority of the church, but were ſuffered to degenerate into a mere lifeleſs form or ſhadow of law, which was treated with indifference, and tranſgreſſed with impunity. To ſum up all in one word, the moſt candid and impartial obſervers of things conſider the council of *Trent* as an aſſembly that was more attentive to what might maintain the deſpotic authority of the pontif, than ſolicitous about entering into the meaſures that were neceſſary to promote the good of the church. It will not therefore appear ſurpriſing, that there are certain doctors of the Romiſh church, who, inſtead of ſubmitting to the deciſions of the council of *Trent* as an ultimate rule of faith, maintain, on the contrary, that theſe deciſions are to be explained by the dictates of *ſcripture* and the language of *tradition.* Nor, when all theſe things were duly conſidered, ſhall we have reaſon to wonder, that this council has not throughout the ſame degree of credit and authority, even in thoſe countries that profeſs the Roman-catholic religion [e].

Some countries, indeed, ſuch as *Germany*, *Poland*, and *Italy*, have adopted *implicitly* and *abſolutely* the decrees of this council, without the ſmalleſt reſtriction of any kind. But in other places it has been received and acknowledged on certain conditions, which modify not a little its pretended authority. Among theſe latter we may reckon the Spaniſh dominions, which diſputed, during many years, the authority of this council, and acknowledged it at length only ſo far as it could be adopted *without any prejudice to the rights and prerogatives of the kings of Spain* [f]. In other countries, ſuch as *France* [g] and *Hungary* [h], it never has been *ſolemnly* received, or

---

☞ [e] The tranſlator has here inſerted in the text the note [h] of the original, and has thrown the citations it contains into different notes.

[f] See GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iv. p. 235.

[g] See HECT. GODOFR. MASII *Diſſ. de Contemptu Concilii Tridentini in Gallia*, which is publiſhed among his other diſſertations collected into one volume. See alſo the excellent diſcourſe which Dr. COURRAYER has ſubjoined to the ſecond volume of his French tranſlation of PAUL SARPI's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, entitled, *Diſcours ſur la Reception du Concile de Trente, particulierement en France*, p. 775-789.

[h] See LORANDI SAMUELOF, *Vita Andr. Dudithii*, p. 56.

publicly acknowledged. It is true indeed, that, in the former of theſe kingdoms, thoſe decrees of *Trent* that relate to points of religious doctrine, have, *tacitly* and *imperceptibly*, through the power of cuſtom, acquired the force and authority of a rule of faith; but thoſe which regard external diſcipline, ſpiritual power, and eccleſiaſtical government, have been conſtantly rejected, both in a public and private manner, as inconſiſtent with the authority and prerogatives of the throne, and prejudicial to the rights and liberties of the Gallican church [*i*].

The principal heads of the Roman-catholic religion.

XXIV. Notwithſtanding all this, ſuch as are deſirous of forming ſome notion of the religion of *Rome*, will do well to conſult the decrees of the council of *Trent*, together with the compendious *confeſſion of faith*, which was drawn up by the order of PIUS IV. Thoſe, however, who expect to derive, from theſe ſources, a clear, complete, and perfect knowledge of the Romiſh faith, will be greatly diſappointed. To evince the truth of this aſſertion, it might be obſerved, as has been already hinted, that both in the decrees of *Trent* and in this papal confeſſion, many things are expreſſed in a vague and ambiguous manner, and that deſignedly, on account of the inteſtine diviſions and warm debates that then reigned in the church. This other ſingular circumſtance might alſo be added, that ſeveral tenets are omitted in both, which no Roman-catholic is allowed to deny, or even to call in queſtion. But, waving both theſe conſiderations, let it only be obſerved, that in theſe *decrees* and in this *confeſſion* ſeveral doctrines and rules of worſhip are inculcated in a much more rational and decent manner, than that in which they appear in the daily ſervice of the church, and in the public practice of its members [*k*]. Hence we may conclude, that the juſteſt notion of the doctrine of *Rome* is not to be derived ſo much from the *terms* made uſe of in the decrees of the council of *Trent*, as from the *real ſignification* of theſe terms, which muſt be drawn from the cuſtoms, inſtitutions, and obſervances, that are, every where, in uſe in the Romiſh church. Add to all this, another conſideration, which is, that in the bulls iſſued out from the papal throne in theſe latter times, certain doctrines, which were obſcurely propoſed in the council of *Trent*, have been explained with ſufficient perſpicuity, and avowed without either heſitation or reſerve. Of this CLEMENT XI. gave a notorious example, in the famous *bull* called UNIGENITUS, which was an enterprize as audacious as it proved unſucceſsful.

[*i*] See LOD. ELL. DU PIN, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, tom. xv. p. 380.

☞ For what relates to the Literary Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, the hiſtorians who have tranſmitted accounts of it, and other circumſtances of that nature, ſee JO. CHR. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 325. 377. as alſo SALIG's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent* (in German), p. 190–320.

The ſtate of exegetic theology, or ſcripture-knowledge.

XXV. As ſoon as the popes perceived the remarkable detriment their authority had ſuffered from the accurate interpretations of the holy ſcriptures that had been given by the learned, and the peruſal of theſe divine oracles, which was now grown more common among the people, they left no methods unemployed that might diſcourage the culture of this moſt important branch of ſacred erudition. While the tide of reſentment ran high, they forgot themſelves in the moſt unaccountable manner. They permitted their cham-

---

☞ [*k*] This is true, in a more eſpecial manner, with reſpect to the canons of the council of *Trent*, relating to the *doctrine of purgatory*, the *invocation of ſaints*, the *worſhip of images and relicks*. The terms employed in theſe canons are artfully choſen, ſo as to avoid the imputation of idolatry, in the *philoſophical* ſenſe of that word; for in the *ſcripture ſenſe* they cannot avoid it, as all uſe of images in religious worſhip is expreſsly forbidden in the ſacred writings in many places. But this circumſpection does not appear in the worſhip of the Roman-catholics, which is notoriouſly idolatrous in both the ſenſes of that word.

pions to indulge themſelves openly in reflections injurious to the dignity of the ſacred writings, and, by an exceſs of blaſphemy almoſt incredible (if the paſſions of men did not render them capable of the greateſt enormities), to declare publicly, that the edicts of the pontifs, and the records of oral tradition, were ſuperior, in point of authority, to the expreſs language of the holy ſcriptures. But as it was impoſſible to bring the ſacred writings wholly into diſrepute, they took the moſt effectual methods in their power to render them obſcure and uſeleſs. For this purpoſe the ancient Latin tranſlation of the Bible, commonly called the *Vulgate*, though it abounds with innumerable groſs errors, and, in a great number of places, exhibits the moſt ſhocking barbarity of ſtyle, and the moſt impenetrable obſcurity with reſpect to the ſenſe of the inſpired writers, was declared, by a ſolemn decree of the council of *Trent*, an *authentic*, i. e. a *faithful, accurate, and perfect* [l] tranſlation, and was conſequently recommended as a

---

☞ [l] If we conſult the canons of the council of *Trent*, we ſhall find that the word *authentic* is there explained in terms leſs poſitive and offenſive than thoſe uſed by Dr. MOSHEIM. Nor is it ſtrictly true, that the *Vulgate* was declared by this council as a production *beyond the reach of criticiſm or cenſure*; ſince, as we learn from FRA-PAOLO, it was determined that this Verſion ſhould be corrected, and a new edition of it publiſhed by perſons appointed for that purpoſe *. There was, indeed, ſomething highly ridiculous in the proceedings of the council in relation to this point; for, if the natural order of things had been obſerved, the reviſal and correction of the *Vulgate* would have preceded the pompous approbation with which the council honoured, and, as it were, conſecrated that ancient Verſion. For how, with any ſhadow of good ſenſe, could the aſſembled fathers ſet the ſeal of their approbation to a work which they acknowledged to ſtand in need of correction, and that before they knew whether or not the correction would anſwer their views, and merit their approbation?

* See FRA. PAOLO SARPI's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, book II. par. LIII. and Dr. COURRAYER's French tranſlation of this Hiſtory, vol. i. p. 284, note (29).

production beyond the reach of criticiſm or cenſure. It was eaſy to foreſee that ſuch a declaration was every way adapted to keep the people in ignorance, and to veil from their underſtandings the true meaning of the ſacred writings. In the ſame council, farther ſteps were taken to execute, with ſucceſs, the deſigns of *Rome.* A ſevere and intolerable law was enacted, with reſpect to all interpreters and expoſitors of the ſcriptures, by which they were forbidden to explain the ſenſe of theſe divine books, *in matters relating to faith and practice,* in ſuch a manner as to make them ſpeak a different language from that of the church and the ancient doctors [*m*]. The ſame law farther declared, that the church alone (*i. e.* its ruler, the Roman pontif) had the right of determining the true meaning and ſignification of ſcripture. To fill up the meaſure of theſe tyrannical and iniquitous proceedings, the church of *Rome* perſiſted obſtinately in affirming, though not always with the ſame impudence and plainneſs of ſpeech, that the holy ſcriptures were not compoſed for the uſe of the multitude, but only for that of their ſpiritual teachers; and, of conſequence, ordered theſe divine records to be taken from the people in all places where it was allowed to execute its imperious commands [*n*].

Commentators and expoſitors of the holy ſcriptures.

XXVI. Theſe circumſtances had a viſible influence upon the ſpirit and productions of the commentators and expoſitors of ſcripture, which the example of LUTHER and his followers had

---

☞ [*m*] It is remarkable, that this prohibition extends even to ſuch interpretations as were not deſigned for public view. *Etiamſi hujuſmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent.* SESSIO 4ta, tit. cap. ii.

[*n*] The pontifs were not allowed to execute this deſpotic order in all countries that acknowledged the juriſdiction of the church of *Rome.* The French and ſome other nations have the Bible in their mother-tongue, in which they peruſe it, though much againſt the will of the creatures of the pope.

rendered,

rendered, through emulation, extremely numerous. The popiſh doctors, who vied with the proteſtants in this branch of ſacred erudition, were inſipid, timorous, ſervilely attached to the glory and intereſts of the court of *Rome*, and diſcovered, in their explications, all the marks of ſlaviſh dependance and conſtraint. They ſeem to have been in conſtant terror leſt any expreſſion ſhould eſcape from their pen that ſavoured of opinions different from what were commonly received; they appeal, every moment, to the declarations and authority of the holy *fathers*, as they uſually ſtile them; nor do they appear to have ſo much conſulted the real doctrines taught by the ſacred writers, as the language and ſentiments which the church of *Rome* has taken the liberty to put into their mouths. Several of theſe commentators rack their imaginations in order to force out of each paſſage of ſcripture the four kinds of ſignifications, called *Literal*, *Allegorical*, *Tropological*, and *Anagogical*, which ignorance and ſuperſtition had firſt invented, and afterwards held ſo ſacred, in the explication of the inſpired writings. Nor was their attachment to this manner of interpretation ſo ill-managed, ſince it enabled them to make the ſacred writers ſpeak the language that was favourable to the views of the church, and to draw out of the Bible, with the help of a little ſubtilty, whatever doctrine they had a mind to impoſe upon the credulity of the multitude.

It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that, beſides theſe miſerable commentators that diſhonour the church of *Rome*, there were ſome in its communion, who had wiſdom enough to deſpiſe theſe ſenſeleſs methods of interpretation, and who, avoiding all myſterious ſignifications and fancies, followed the plain, natural, and literal ſenſe of the expreſſions uſed in the holy ſcriptures. In this claſs the moſt eminent were ERASMUS of *Rotterdam*, who tranſlated into Latin, with an elegant and faithful ſimplicity, the books of the New Teſtament, and explained them with judgment in a paraphraſe which is deſervedly eſteemed; Cardinal CAJETAN, who diſputed with LUTHER at *Augſburg*, and who gave a brief, but judicious expoſition of almoſt all the books of the Old and New Teſtament; FRANCIS TITELMAN, ISIDORUS CLARIUS, JOHN MALDONAT, BENEDICT JUSTINIAN, who acquired no mean reputation by their commentaries on the Epiſtles of St. *Paul.* To theſe may be added GAIGNY, DE'ESPENCE, and other Expoſitors [*o*]. But theſe eminent men, whoſe example was ſo adapted to excite emulation, had almoſt no followers; and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, their influence was gone, and their labours were forgot. For, towards the concluſion of this century, EDMUND RICHER, that ſtrenuous oppoſer of the encroachments made by the pontifs on the liberties of the Gallican church, was the only doctor in the univerſity of *Paris* who followed the literal ſenſe and the plain and natural ſignification of the words of ſcripture; while all the other commentators and interpreters, imitating the pernicious example of ſeveral ancient expoſitors, were always racking their brains for myſterious and ſublime ſignifications, where none ſuch were, nor could be, deſigned by the ſacred writers [*p*].

The ſtate of didactic theology.

XXVII. The ſeminaries of learning were filled, before the Reformation, with that ſubtile kind of theological doctors, commonly known under the denomination of *ſchoolmen*; ſo that even at *Paris*, which was conſidered as the principal ſeat of ſacred erudition, no doctors were to be found who were capable of diſputing with the proteſtant divines in

---

[*o*] See SIMON, *Hiſt. Critique du Vieux et de Nouv. Teſtament.*

[*p*] See BAILLET, *Vie d'Edmund Richer*, p. 9, 10.

the method they generally purſued, which was that of proving the doctrines they maintained by arguments drawn from the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the fathers. This uncommon ſcarcity of *didactic* and *ſcriptural* divines produced much confuſion and perplexity, on many occaſions, even in the council of *Trent*; where the ſcholaſtic doctors fatigued ſome, and almoſt turned the heads of others, by examining and explaining the doctrines that were there propoſed, according to the intricate and ambiguous rules of their captious philoſophy. Hence it became abſolutely neceſſary to reform the methods of proceeding in theological diſquiſitions, and to reſtore to its former credit that which drew the truths of religion more from the dictates of the ſacred writings, and from the ſentiments of the ancient doctors, than from the uncertain ſuggeſtions of human reaſon, and the ingenious conjectures of philoſophy [q]. It was, however, impoſſible to deprive entirely the ſcholaſtic divines of the aſcendant they had acquired in the ſeminaries of learning, and had ſo long maintained almoſt without oppoſition. Nay, after having been threatened with a diminution of their authority, they ſeemed to reſume new vigour from the time that the Jeſuits adopted their philoſophy, and made uſe of their ſubtile dialectic, as a more effectual armour againſt the attacks of the heretics, than either the language of ſcripture, or the authority of the fathers. And, indeed, this intricate jargon of the ſchools was every way proper to anſwer the purpoſes of a ſet of men, who found it neceſſary to puzzle and perplex, where they could neither refute with perſpicuity, nor prove with evidence. Thus they artfully concealed their defeat, and retreated, in the dazzled eyes of the multitude, with the appearance of victory [r].

---

[q] See Du Boulay's account of the Reformation of the Theological *Faculty*, or College at *Paris*, in his *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. vi. p. 790. In this reform, the Batchelors of Divinity, called *Sententiarii* and *Biblici*, are particularly diſtinguiſhed; and (what is extremely remarkable) the *Auguſtine* monks, who were Luther's fraternity, are ordered to furniſh the college of divinity once a-year with a *ſcriptural Batchelor* (*Baccalaureum Biblicum præſentare*); from whence we may conclude, that the monks of the Auguſtine order, to which Luther belonged, were much more converſant in the ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures than the other Monaſtic ſocieties. But this academical law deſerves to be quoted here at length, and that ſo much the more, as Du Boulay's Hiſtory is in few hands. It is as follows; *Auguſtinenſes quolibet anno Biblicum præſentabunt, ſecundum ſtatuum fol.* 21. *quod ſequitur: Quilibet ordo Mendicantium et Collegium S. Bernardi habeat quolibet anno Biblicum qui legat ordinarie, alioqui priventur Baccalaureo ſententiario.* It appears by this *law*, that each of the Mendicant orders was, by a decree of the Theological Faculty, obliged to furniſh, yearly, a *ſcriptural Batchelor* (ſuch was Luther); and yet we ſee, that in the *Reformation* already mentioned, this obligation is impoſed upon none but the Auguſtine monks; from which it is natural to conclude, that the Dominicans, Franciſcans,

The Myſtics loſt almoſt all their credit in the church of *Rome* after the Reformation; and that, partly on account of the favourable reception they found among the proteſtants, and partly in conſequence of their pacific ſyſtem, which, giving them an averſion to controverſy in general, rendered them little diſpoſed to defend the papal cauſe againſt its numerous and formidable adverſaries. Theſe enthuſiaſts however were, in ſome meaſure, tolerated in the church of *Rome*, and allowed to indulge themſelves in their philoſophical ſpeculations, on certain conditions, which obliged them to abſtain from cenſuring either the laws or the corruptions of the church, and from declaiming,

---

Franciſcans, and the other Mendicants, had entirely neglected the ſtudy of the Scriptures, and conſequently had among them no *ſcriptural Batchelors*; and that the Auguſtine monks alone were in a condition to ſatisfy the demands of the Theological Faculty.

☞ [r] The tranſlator has added the two laſt ſentences of this paragraph, to illuſtrate more fully the ſenſe of the author.

with their uſual freedom and vehemence, againſt the vanity of external worſhip, and the diſſenſions of jarring and contentious doctors.

The ſtate of morality and practical religion.

XXVIII. There was no ſucceſsful attempt made, in this century, to correct or improve the practical or moral ſyſtem of doctrine that was followed in the church of *Rome*; nor, indeed, could any make ſuch an attempt without drawing upon him the diſpleaſure, and perhaps the fury, of the papal hierarchy. For, in reality, ſuch a project of reformation ſeemed in no wiſe conducive to the *intereſts* of the church, as theſe intereſts were underſtood by its ambitious and rapacious rulers. And it is undoubtedly certain, that many doctrines and regulations, on which the power, opulence, and grandeur of that church eſſentially depended, would have run the riſk of falling into diſcredit and contempt, if the pure and rational ſyſtem of morality, contained in the goſpel, had been exhibited in its native beauty and ſimplicity, to the view and peruſal of all Chriſtians without diſtinction. Little or no zeal was therefore exerted in amending or improving the doctrines that immediately relate to practice. On the contrary, many perſons of eminent piety and integrity, in the communion of *Rome*, have grievouſly complained (with what juſtice ſhall be ſhewn in its proper place [*s*]), that, as ſoon as the Jeſuits had gained an aſcendant in the courts of princes and in the ſchools of learning, the cauſe of virtue began viſibly to decline. It has been alleged, more particularly, that this artful order employed all the force of their ſubtile diſtinctions to ſap the foundations of morality, and, in proceſs of time, opened a door to all ſorts of licentiouſneſs and iniquity, by the looſe and diſſolute rules of conduct they propagated as far as their influence extended.

☞ [*s*] See Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part I. Chap. I. § XXXIV.

extended. This poiſonous doctrine ſpread, indeed, its contagion, in a latent manner, during the ſixteenth century; but, in the following age, its abettors ventured to expoſe ſome ſpecimens of its turpitude to public view, and thus gave occaſion to great commotions in ſeveral parts of *Europe*.

All the moral writers of the Romiſh church, in this century, may be diſtinguiſhed into three claſſes, the *Schoolmen*, the *Dogmatiſts* [t], and the *Myſtics*. The firſt explained, or rather obſcured, the virtues and duties of the Chriſtian life, by knotty diſtinctions, and unintelligible forms of ſpeech, and buried them under an enormous load of arguments and demonſtrations. The ſecond illuſtrated them from the declarations of ſcripture, and the opinions of the ancient doctors. While the third placed the whole of morality in the tranquillity of a mind withdrawn from all ſenſible objects, and habitually employed in the contemplation of the divine nature.

The ſtate of religious controverſy.

XXIX. The number of combatants that the pontifs brought into the field of controverſy, during this century, was prodigious, and their glaring defects are abundantly known. It may be ſaid, with truth, of the moſt of them, that, like many warriors of another claſs, they generally loſt ſight of all conſiderations, except thoſe of victory and plunder. The diſputants, which the order of Jeſuits ſent forth in great number againſt the adverſaries of the church of *Rome*, ſurpaſſed all the reſt in ſubtilty, impudence, and invective. But the chief leader and champion of the polemic tribe was ROBERT BELLARMINE, a Jeſuit, and one of the college of cardinals, who treated, in ſeveral bulky volumes, of all the controverſies that ſub-

---

☞ [t] The reader will eaſily perceive, by the ſhort account of theſe three claſſes that is given by Dr. MOSHEIM, that the word *Dogmatiſt* muſt not be taken in that *magiſterial* ſenſe, which it bears in modern language.

ſiſted between the proteſtants and the church of *Rome*, and whoſe merit as a writer conſiſted, principally, in clearneſs of ſtyle, and a certain copiouſneſs of argument, which ſhewed a rich and fruitful imagination. This eminent defender of the church of *Rome* aroſe about the concluſion of this century, and, on his firſt appearance, all the force and attacks of the moſt illuſtrious proteſtant doctors were turned againſt him alone. His candor and plain-dealing expoſed him, however, to the cenſures of ſeveral divines of his own communion; for he collected, with diligence, the reaſons and objections of his adverſaries, and propoſed them, for the moſt part, in their full force, with integrity and exactneſs. Had he been leſs remarkable on account of his fidelity and induſtry; had he taken care to ſelect the weakeſt arguments of his antagoniſts, and to render them ſtill weaker, by propoſing them in an imperfect and unfaithful light, his fame would have been much greater among the friends of *Rome*, than it actually is [u].

The controverſies that divide the church of *Rome*.

XXX. If we turn our view to the internal ſtate of the church of *Rome*, and conſider the reſpective ſentiments, opinions, and manners of its different members, we ſhall find that, notwithſtanding its boaſted unity of faith, and its oſtentatious pretenſions to harmony and concord, it was, in this century, and is, at this day, divided and diſtracted with diſſenſions and conteſts of various kinds. The Franciſcans and the Dominicans contend with vehemence about ſeveral points of doctrine and diſcipline. The Scotiſts and Thomiſts are at eternal war. The biſhops have never ceaſed diſputing with the pontif (and the *congregations* that he has inſtituted to maintain his pretenſions) concerning the origin and limits of his authority and juriſdiction. The French and Flemings, together with other countries, openly oppoſe the Roman pontif on many occaſions, and refuſe to acknowledge his ſupreme and unlimited dominion in the church; while, on the other hand, he ſtill continues to encroach upon their privileges, ſometimes with violence and reſolution, when he can do ſo with impunity, at other times with circumſpection and prudence, when vigorous meaſures appear dangerous or unneceſſary. The Jeſuits, who, from their firſt riſe, had formed the project of diminiſhing the credit and influence of all the other religious orders, uſed their warmeſt endeavours to ſhare with the Benedictines and other monaſteries, which were richly endowed, a part of their opulence; and their endeavours were crowned with ſucceſs. Thus they drew upon their ſociety the indignation and vengeance of the other religious communities, and armed againſt it the monks of every other denomination; and, in a more eſpecial manner, the Benedictines and Dominicans, who ſurpaſſed all its enemies in the keenneſs and bitterneſs of their reſentment. The rage of the Benedictines is animated by a painful reflection on the poſſeſſions of which they had been deprived; while the Dominicans contend for the honour of their order, the privileges annexed to it, and the religious tenets by which it is diſtinguiſhed. Nor are the theological collegies and ſeminaries of learning more exempt from the flame of controverſy than the clerical and monaſtic orders; on the contrary, debates concerning almoſt all the doctrines of Chriſtianity are multiplied in them beyond number, and conducted with little moderation. It is true indeed, that all theſe conteſts are tempered and managed, by the prudence and authority of the Roman pontifs, in ſuch a manner as to prevent their being carried to an exceſſive height, to a length that might prove fatal to the church, by deſtroying that phantom of external unity that is the ſource of its conſiſtence as an eccleſiaſtical body. I ſay *tempered* and *managed*; for to heal entirely theſe diviſions, and calm theſe animoſities, however it may be judged an undertaking worthy of one who calls himſelf the *Vicar of Chriſt*, is, nevertheleſs, a work beyond the power, and contrary to the intention, of the Roman pontif.

---

[u] See Jo. FRID. MAYERI *Ecloga de fide Baronii et Bellarmini ipſis pontificiis dubia*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 8vo, in 1698.

The more momentous controverſies that have divided the church of *Rome*.

XXXI. Beſides theſe debates of inferior moment, which made only a ſlight breach in the tranquillity and union of the church of *Rome*, there aroſe, after the period in which the council of *Trent* was aſſembled, controverſies of much greater importance, which deſervedly attracted the attention of Chriſtians of all denominations. Theſe controverſies were ſet on foot by the Jeſuits, and from ſmall beginnings have increaſed gradually, and gathered ſtrength; ſo that the flame they produced has been tranſmitted even to our times, and continues, at this very day, to divide the members of the Romiſh church in a manner that does not a little endanger its ſtability. While the Roman pontifs foment, perhaps, inſtead of endeavouring to extinguiſh, the leſs momentous diſputes mentioned above, they obſerve a different conduct with reſpect to thoſe now under conſideration. The moſt zealous efforts of artifice and authority are conſtantly employed to calm the contending parties (ſince it appears impoſſible to unite and reconcile them), and to diminiſh the violence of commotion, which they can ſcarcely ever hope entirely to ſuppreſs. Their efforts however have hitherto been, and ſtill continue to be, ineffectual. They have not been able to calm the agitation and vehemence with which theſe debates are carried on, nor to inſpire any ſentiments of moderation and mutual forbearance into minds, which are leſs animated by the love of truth, than by the ſpirit of faction.

Two general claſſes of doctors in the church of *Rome*.

XXXII. Whoever looks with attention and impartiality into theſe controverſies will eaſily perceive, that there are two parties in the Roman church, whoſe notions with reſpect both to doctrine and diſcipline are extremely different. The Jeſuits, in general, conſidered as a body [*w*], maintain, with the greateſt zeal and obſtinacy, the ancient ſyſtem of doctrine and manners, which was univerſally adopted in the church before the riſe of LUTHER, and which, though abſurd and ill-digeſted, has, nevertheleſs, been conſidered as highly favourable to the views of *Rome*, and the grandeur of its pontifs. Theſe ſagacious eccleſiaſtics, whoſe peculiar office it is to watch for the ſecurity and defence of the papal throne, are fully perſuaded that the authority of the pontifs, as well as the opulence, pomp, and grandeur of the clergy, depend entirely upon the preſervation of the ancient forms of doctrine; and that every project that tends either to remove theſe forms, or even to correct them, muſt be, in the higheſt degree, detrimental to what they call the intereſts of the church, and gradually bring on its ruin. On the other hand, there are within the pale of the Roman church, eſpecially ſince the dawn of the Reformation, many pious and well-meaning men, whoſe eyes have been opened, by the peruſal of the inſpired and primitive writers, upon the corruptions and defects of the received forms of doctrine and diſcipline. Comparing the dictates of primitive Chriſtianity with the vulgar ſyſtem of popery, they have found the latter full of enormities, and have always been deſirous of a Reformation

---

☞ [*w*] The Jeſuits are here taken in the general and collective ſenſe of that denomination; becauſe there are ſeveral individuals of that order, whoſe ſentiments differ from thoſe that generally prevail in their community.

tion (though indeed a partial one, according to their particular fancies), that thus the church might be purified from thoſe unhappy abuſes that have given riſe to ſuch fatal diviſions, and ſtill draw upon it the cenſures and reproaches of the heretics.

The main controverſies that divide the church of *Rome* reduced to ſix heads.

From theſe oppoſite ways of thinking, aroſe naturally the warmeſt contentions and debates between the Jeſuits and ſeveral doctors of the church of *Rome*. Theſe debates may be reduced under the *ſix* following heads;

Firſt ſubject of debate.

The *firſt* ſubject of debate concerns the *limits and extent of the power and juriſdiction of the Roman pontif*. The Jeſuits, with their numerous tribe of followers and dependents, all maintain, that the pope is *infallible*;—that he is the only viſible ſource of that univerſal and unlimited power which CHRIST has granted to the church;—that all biſhops and ſubordinate rulers derive from him alone the authority and juriſdiction with which they are inveſted;—that he is not bound by any laws of the church, nor by any decrees of the councils that compoſe it;—and that he alone is the ſupreme lawgiver of that ſacred community, a lawgiver whoſe edicts and commands it is in the higheſt degree criminal to oppoſe or diſobey. Such are the ſtrange ſentiments of the Jeſuits; but they are very far from being univerſally adopted. For other doctors of the church of *Rome* hold, on the contrary, that the pope is liable to error;—that his authority is inferior to that of a general council;—that he is bound to obey the commands of the church, and its laws, as they are enacted in the councils that repreſent it;—that theſe councils have a right to depoſe him from the papal chair, when he abuſes, in a flagrant manner, the dignity and prerogatives with which he is intruſted;—and that, in conſequence of theſe principles, the biſhops and other inferior rulers and doctors derive the authority that is annexed to their reſpective dignities, not from the Roman pontif, but from CHRIST himſelf.

Second ſubject of debate.

XXXIII. The *extent and prerogatives of the church* form the *ſecond* ſubject of debate. The Jeſuits and their adherents ſtretch out its borders far and wide. They comprehend within its large circuit, not only many who live ſeparate from the communion of *Rome* [x], but even extend the inheritance of eternal ſalvation to nations that have not the leaſt knowledge of the Chriſtian religion, or of its divine author, and conſider as true members of the church open tranſgreſſors which profeſs its doctrines. But the adverſaries of the Jeſuits reduce within narrower limits the kingdom of CHRIST, and not only exclude from all hope of ſalvation thoſe who are not within the pale of the church of *Rome*, but alſo thoſe who, though they live within its external communion, yet diſhonour their profeſſion by a vicious and profligate courſe of life. The Jeſuits, moreover, not to mention other differences of leſs moment, aſſert, that the church can never pronounce an erroneous or unjuſt deciſion, either relating to *matters of fact*, or *points of doctrine* [y]; while the adverſe party declare,

---

☞ [x] They were accuſed at *Spoleto*, in the year 1653, of having maintained, in their public inſtructions there, the probability of the ſalvation of many heretics. See LE CLERC, *Biblioth. Univerſ. et Hiſtorique*, tom. xiv. p. 320.

☞ [y] This diſtinction, with reſpect to the *objects* of infallibility, was chiefly owing to the following hiſtorical circumſtance: Pope INNOCENT X. condemned *five propoſitions*, drawn from the famous book of JANSENIUS, entitled, *Auguſtinus*. This condemnation occaſioned the two following queſtions: *1ſt*, Whether or no theſe propoſitions were erroneous? This was the queſtion *de jure*, i. e. as the tranſlator has rendered it, the queſtion *relating to doctrine*. *2d*, Whether or no theſe propoſitions were really taught by JANSENIUS? This was the queſtion *de facto*, i. e. relating to the matter of fact. The church was ſuppoſed, by ſome, infallible only in deciding queſtions of the former kind.

declare, that, in judging of matters of fact, it is not ſecured againſt all poſſibility of erring.

The third ſubject of debate.

XXXIV. The *third* claſs of controverſies, that divides the church of *Rome*, comprehends the debates relating to the *nature*, *efficacy*, and *neceſſity of divine grace*, together with thoſe that concern *original ſin*, the *natural power* of man to obey the laws of God, and the *nature* and *foundation* of thoſe *eternal decrees* that have for their object the ſalvation of men. The Dominicans, Auguſtins, and Janſeniſts, with ſeveral other doctors of the church, adopt the following propoſitions: That the *impulſe* of divine grace cannot be *oppoſed* or *reſiſted*;—that there are no *remains* of *purity* or *goodneſs* in human nature ſince its fall;—that the *eternal decrees* of God, relating to the ſalvation of men, are neither founded upon, nor attended with, any condition whatſoever;—that God wills the ſalvation of all mankind; and ſeveral other tenets that are connected with theſe. The Jeſuits maintain, on the contrary, that the *natural dominion* of ſin in the human mind, and the hidden corruption it has produced in our internal frame, are leſs *univerſal* and *dreadful* than they are repreſented by the doctors now mentioned;—that *human nature* is far from being deprived of *all power* of doing good;—that the *ſuccours of grace* are adminiſtered to *all mankind* in a meaſure *ſufficient* to lead them to eternal life and ſalvation;—that the *operations* of grace offer no violence to the faculties and powers of nature, and therefore may be *reſiſted*;—and that God from all eternity has appointed everlaſting rewards and puniſhments, as the portion of men in a future world, not by an *abſolute*, *arbitrary*, and *unconditional* decree, but in conſequence of that divine and unlimited *preſcience*, by which he foreſaw the *actions*, *merits*, and *characters* of every individual.

XXXV. The

The fourth ſubject of debate.

XXXV. The *fourth* head, in this diviſion of the controverſies that deſtroy the pretended unity of the church of *Rome*, contains various ſubjects of debate, relative to *doctrines of morality* and *rules of practice*, which it would be both tedious and foreign from our purpoſe to enumerate in a circumſtantial manner; though it may not be improper to touch lightly the firſt principles of this endleſs controverſy [z].

The Jeſuits and their followers have inculcated a very ſtrange doctrine with reſpect to the motives that determine the moral conduct and actions of men. They repreſent it as a matter of perfect indifference from what motives men obey the laws of God, provided theſe laws are really obeyed; and maintain, that the ſervice of thoſe who obey from the fear of puniſhment is as agreeable to the Deity, as thoſe actions which proceed from a principle of love to him and to his laws. This deciſion excites the horror of the greateſt part of the doctors of the Roman church, who affirm, that no acts of obedience, that do not proceed from the love of God, can be acceptable to that pure and holy Being. Nor is the doctrine of the Jeſuits only chargeable with the corrupt tenets already mentioned. They maintain farther, that a man never ſins, properly ſpeaking, but when he tranſgreſſeth a divine law, which is *fully known* to him, which is *preſent to his mind* while he acts, and of which he *underſtands the true meaning* and intent. And they conclude from hence, that, in ſtrict juſtice, the conduct of that tranſgreſſor cannot be looked upon as criminal, who is either ignorant of the law, or is in doubt about its ſignification, or loſes ſight of it, through forgetfulneſs, at the time that he violates it. From theſe propoſitions they deduce the famous doctrines of *probability* and *philoſophical ſin*, that have caſt an eternal reproach upon the ſchools of the Jeſuits [a]. Their adverſaries behold theſe pernicious tenets with the utmoſt abhorrence, and aſſert that neither ignorance, nor forgetfulneſs of the law, nor the doubts that may be entertained with reſpect to its ſignification, will be admitted as ſufficient to juſtify tranſgreſſors before the tribunal of God. This conteſt, about the main and fundamental points of morality, has given riſe to a great variety of debates concerning the duties we owe to God, our

---

[z] No author has given a more accurate, preciſe, and clear enumeration of the objections that have been made to the moral doctrine of the Jeſuits, and the reproaches that have been caſt on their rules of life; and none at the ſame time has defended their cauſe with more art and dexterity, than the eloquent and ingenious Gabriel Daniel (a famous member of their order), in a piece, entitled, *Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe*. This dialogue is to be found in the firſt volume of his *Opuſcules*, p. 351. and was deſigned as an anſwer to the celebrated *Provincial Letters* of Pascal, which did more real prejudice to the ſociety of the Jeſuits, than can be well imagined, and expoſed their looſe and perfidious ſyſtem of morals with the greateſt fidelity and perſpicuity, embelliſhed by the moſt exquiſite ſtrokes of humour and irony. Father Daniel, in the piece above mentioned, treats with great acuteneſs the famous doctrine of *probability*, p. 351; the method of *directing our intentions*, p. 556; *equivocation* and *mental reſervation*, p. 562; *ſins of ignorance and oblivion*, p. 719; and it muſt be acknowledged, that, if the cauſe of the Jeſuits were ſuſceptible of defence or plauſibility, it has found in this writer an able and dexterous champion.

☞ [a] The doctrine of *probability* conſiſts in this: *That an opinion or precept may be followed with a good conſcience, when it is inculcated by four, or three, or two, nay even by one doctor of any conſiderable reputation, even though it be contrary to the judgment of him that follows it, and even of him that recommends it.* This doctrine rendered the Jeſuits capable of accommodating themſelves to all the different paſſions of men, and to perſons of all tempers and characters, from the moſt auſtere to the moſt licentious. *Philoſophical ſin*, according to the Jeſuits doctrine, *is an action, or courſe of actions, that is repugnant to the dictates of reaſon, and yet not offenſive to the Deity.* See a fuller account of theſe two odious doctrines in the following part of this work, Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part I. Chap. I. § XXXV. and in the author's and tranſlator's notes.

neighbour, and ourſelves; and produced two ſects of moral doctors, whoſe animoſities and diviſions have miſerably rent the church of *Rome* in all parts of the world, and involved it in the greateſt perplexities.

The fifth ſubject of debate.

XXXVI. The adminiſtration of the ſacraments, eſpecially thoſe of *penance* and the *euchariſt*, forms the *fifth* ſubject of controverſy in the church of *Rome*. The Jeſuits and many other doctors are of opinion, that the ſalutary effects of the ſacraments are produced by their *intrinſic virtue* and *immediate operation* [b] upon the mind at the time they are adminiſtered, and that conſequently it requires but little preparation to receive them to edification and comfort; nor do they think that God requires a mind adorned with inward purity, and a heart animated with divine love, in order to the obtaining of the ends and purpoſes of theſe religious inſtitutions. And hence it is, that according to their doctrine, the prieſts are empowered to give immediate abſolution to all ſuch as confeſs their tranſgreſſions and crimes, and afterwards to admit them to the uſe of the ſacraments. But ſuch ſentiments are rejected with indignation by all thoſe of the Romiſh communion who have the progreſs of vital and practical religion truly at heart.

☞ [b] This is the only expreſſion that occurred to the tranſlator, as proper to render the true ſenſe of that phraſe of the ſcholaſtic divines, who ſay, that the ſacraments produce their effect *opera operato*. The Jeſuits and Dominicans maintain, that the ſacraments have in themſelves an *inſtrumental* and *efficient* power, by virtue of which they work in the ſoul (independently on its previous preparation or propenſities) a diſpoſition to receive the divine grace; and this is what is commonly called the *opus operatum* of the ſacraments. Thus, according to their doctrine, neither knowledge, wiſdom, humility, faith, nor devotion, are neceſſary to the efficacy of the ſacraments, whoſe victorious energy nothing but a *mortal ſin* can reſiſt. See Dr. COURRAYER's *Tranſlation* of PAUL SARPI's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent*, tom. i. livr. ii. p. 423, 424. edit. *Amſterdam.*

heart. Theſe look upon it as the duty of the clergy to uſe the greateſt diligence and aſſiduity in examining the characters, tempers, and actions of thoſe who demand abſolution and the uſe of the ſacraments, before they grant their requeſts; ſince, in their ſenſe of things, the real benefits of theſe inſtitutions can extend to thoſe only whoſe hearts are carefully purged from the corruptions of iniquity, and filled with that divine love *that caſteth out fear*. Hence aroſe that famous diſpute in the church of *Rome*, concerning a *frequent approach to the holy communion*, which was carried on with ſuch warmth in the laſt century, between the Jeſuits and the Janſeniſts, with ARNAULD [c] at the head of the latter, and has been renewed in our times by the Jeſuit PICHON, who thereby incurred the indignation of the greateſt part of the French biſhops [d]. The frequent celebration of the Lord's ſupper is one of the main duties, which the Jeſuits recommended with peculiar earneſtneſs to thoſe who are under their ſpiritual direction, repreſenting it as the moſt certain and infallible method of appeaſing the Deity, and obtaining from him the entire remiſſion of their ſins and tranſgreſſions. This manner of proceeding the Janſeniſts cenſure with their uſual ſeverity; and it is alſo condemned by many other learned and pious doctors of the Romiſh communion, who reject that *intrinſic virtue and efficient operation* that is attributed to the ſacraments, and wiſely maintain, that the receiving the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper can be profitable to thoſe only whoſe minds are prepared, by faith, repentance, and the love of God, for that ſolemn ſervice.

---

[c] ARNAULD publiſhed, on this occaſion, his famous book concerning the *Practice of communicating frequently*. The French title is, *Traité de la frequente Communion.*

[d] See *Journal Univerſel*, tom. xiii. p. 148. tom. xv. p. 363. tom. xvi. p. 124.

The ſixth ſubject of debate.

XXXVII. The *ſixth* and laſt controverſy turns upon the proper method of inſtructing Chriſtians in the truths and precepts of religion. One part of the Romiſh doctors, who have the progreſs of religion truly at heart, look upon it as expedient, and even neceſſary, to ſow the ſeeds of divine truth in the mind, in the tender and flexible ſtate of infancy, when it is moſt ſuſceptible of good impreſſions, and to give it by degrees, according to the meaſure of its capacity, a full and accurate knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others, who have a greater zeal for the intereſts of the church than the improvement of its members, recommend a devout ignorance to ſuch as ſubmit to their direction, and think a Chriſtian ſufficiently inſtructed when he has learned to yield a blind and unlimited obedience to the orders of the church. The former are of opinion, that nothing can be ſo profitable and inſtructive to Chriſtians as the ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures, and conſequently judge it highly expedient that they ſhould be tranſlated into the vulgar tongue of each country. The latter exclude the people from the ſatisfaction of conſulting the ſacred oracles of truth, and look upon all vernacular tranſlations of the Bible as dangerous, and even of a pernicious tendency. They accordingly maintain, that it ought only to be publiſhed in a learned language, to prevent its inſtructions from becoming familiar to the multitude. The former compoſe pious and inſtructive books to nouriſh a ſpirit of devotion in the minds of Chriſtians, to enlighten their ignorance, and diſpel their errors; they illuſtrate and explain the public prayers and the ſolemn acts of religion in the language of the people, and exhort all, who attend to their inſtructions, to peruſe conſtantly theſe pious productions, in order to improve their knowledge, purify their affections, and

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART I.

and to learn the method of worſhipping the Deity in a rational and acceptable manner. All this, however, is highly diſpleaſing to the latter kind of doctors, who are always apprehenſive, that the blind obedience and implicit ſubmiſſion of the people will diminiſh in proportion as their views are enlarged, and their knowledge increaſed [e].

The diſputes carried on with Baius concerning grace, *&c.*

XXXVIII. All the controverſies that have been here mentioned did not break out at the ſame time. The diſputes concerning divine grace, the natural power of man to perform good actions, original ſin, and predeſtination, which have been ranged under the third claſs, were publicly carried on in the century of which we are now writing. The others were conducted with more ſecrecy and reſerve, and did not come forth to public view before the following age. Nor will this appear at all ſurpriſing to thoſe who conſider that the controverſies concerning *grace* and *free-will*, which had been ſet in motion by LUTHER, were neither accurately examined, nor peremptorily decided, in the church of *Rome*, but were rather artfully ſuſpended and huſhed into ſilence. The ſentiments of LUTHER were indeed condemned; but no fixed and perſpicuous rule of faith, with reſpect to theſe diſputed points, was ſubſtituted in their place. The deciſions of St. AUGUSTIN were ſolemnly approved; but the difference between theſe deciſions and the ſentiments of LUTHER were never clearly explained. The firſt riſe of this fatal controverſy was owing to the zeal of MICHAEL BAIUS, a doctor in the univerſity of *Louvain*, equally remarkable on account of the warmth of his piety and the extent of his learning. This eminent divine, like the other followers of AUGUSTIN, had an invincible averſion to that contentious, ſubtile, and intricate manner of teaching theology, that had long prevailed in the *ſchools*; and under the auſpicious name of that famous prelate, who was his darling guide, he had the courage or temerity to condemn and cenſure, in an open and public manner, the tenets commonly received in the church of *Rome*, in relation to the *natural powers of man*, and the *merit of good works*. This bold ſtep drew upon BAIUS the indignation of ſome of his academical colleagues, and the heavy cenſures of ſeveral Franciſcan monks. Whether the Jeſuits immediately joined in this oppoſition, and may be reckoned among the firſt accuſers of BAIUS, is a matter unknown, or, at moſt, uncertain; but it is unqueſtionably evident and certain, that, even at the riſe of this controverſy, they abhorred the principal tenets of BAIUS, which he had taken from AUGUSTIN, and adopted as his own. In the year 1567, this doctor was accuſed at the court of *Rome*, and *ſeventy-ſix propoſitions*, drawn from his writings, were condemned by pope PIUS V., in a circular letter expreſsly compoſed for that purpoſe. This condemnation, however, was iſſued out in an artful and inſidious manner, without any mention being made of the name of the author; for the fatal conſequences that had ariſen from the raſh and inconſiderate meaſures employed by the court of *Rome* againſt LUTHER, were too freſh in the remembrance of the prudent pontif to permit his falling into new blunders of the ſame nature. The thunder of excommunication was therefore ſuppreſſed by the dictates of prudence, and the perſon and functions of BAIUS were ſpared, while his tenets were cenſured. About thirteen years after this tranſaction, GREGORY XIII. complied ſo far with the importunate ſolicitations of a Jeſuit, named TOLET, as to reinforce the ſentence of PIUS V., by a new condemnation of the opinions of the Flemiſh doctor. BAIUS ſubmitted to this new ſentence, either from an apprehenſion that it would be followed by ſeverer proceedings in caſe of reſiſtance, or, which is more probable, on account of the ambiguity that reigned in the papal edict, and the vague and confuſed manner in which the obnoxious propoſitions were therein expreſſed. But his example, in this reſpect, was not followed by the other doctors who had formed their theological ſyſtem upon that of AUGUSTIN [*f*]; and, even, at this day, many divines of the Romiſh communion, and particularly the Janſeniſts, declare openly that BAIUS was unjuſtly treated, and that the two edicts of PIUS and GREGORY, mentioned above, are abſolutely deſtitute of all authority, and have never been received as laws of the church [g].

---

[e] The account here given of the more momentous controverſies that divide the church of *Rome*, may be confirmed, illuſtrated, and enlarged, by conſulting a multitude of books publiſhed in the laſt and preſent centuries, eſpecially in *France* and *Flanders*, by Janſeniſts, Dominicans, Jeſuits, and others. All the productions, in which the doctrine and precepts of the Jeſuits, and the other creatures of the Roman pontif, are oppoſed and refuted, are enumerated by DOMINICK COLONIA, a French Jeſuit, in a work publiſhed, in 1735, under the following title; *Bibliotheque Janſeniſte, ou Catalogue Alphabetique des principaux livres Janſeniſtes, ou ſuſpects de Janſeniſme, avec des notes critiques.* This writer is led into many abſurdities by his extravagant attachment to the Roman pontif, and to the cauſe and tenets of his order. His book, however, is of uſe in pointing out the various controverſies that perplex and divide the church of *Rome*. It was condemned by the late pope BENEDICT XIV.; but was, nevertheleſs, republiſhed in a new form, with ſome change in the title, and additions, that ſwelled it from one octavo volume to four of the ſame ſize. This new edition appeared at *Antwerp* in the year 1752, under the following title; *Dictionnaire des livres Janſeniſtes, ou qui favoriſent le Janſeniſme, à Anvres ches J. B. Verduſſen.* And it muſt be acknowledged, that it is extremely uſeful, in ſhewing the inteſtine diviſions of the church, the particular conteſts that divide its doctors, the religious tenets of the Jeſuits, and the numerous productions that relate to the ſix heads of controverſy here mentioned. It muſt be obſerved, at the ſame time, that this work abounds with the moſt malignant invectives againſt many perſons of eminent learning and piety, and with the moſt notorious inſtances of partiality and injuſtice *.

☞ * See a particular account of this learned and ſcandalous work in the firſt and ſecond volumes of the *Bibliotheque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, printed at the *Hague*.

[*f*] See, for an account of the diſputes relating to BAIUS, the works of that author, publiſhed in 4to at *Cologn*, in 1696, particularly the ſecond part, or appendix, entitled, *Baiana, ſeu*

Conteſts with the Jeſuits, Leſſius, and Hamedius.

XXXIX. Be that as it may, it is at leaſt certain, that the doctrine of AUGUSTIN, with reſpect to the nature and operations of divine grace, loſt none of its credit in conſequence of theſe edicts, but was embraced and propagated, with the ſame zeal as formerly, throughout all the Belgic provinces, and more eſpecially in the two flouriſhing univerſities of *Louvain* and *Douay*. This appeared very ſoon after, when two Jeſuits, named LESSIUS and HAMEDIUS, ventured to repreſent the doctrine of predeſtination in a manner different from that in which it appears in the writings of AUGUSTIN: For the ſentiments of theſe Jeſuits were publicly condemned by the doctors of *Louvain* in the year 1587, and by thoſe of *Douay* the year following. The biſhops of the Low-Countries were diſpoſed to follow the example of theſe two univerſities, and had already deliberated about aſſembling a provincial council for this purpoſe, when the Roman pontif SIXTUS V., ſuſpended their proceedings by the interpoſition of his authority, and declared, that the cognizance and deciſion of religious controverſies belonged only to the vicar of CHRIST, reſiding at *Rome*. But this cunning

---

ſeu Scripta, quæ controverſias ſpectant occaſione ſententiarum Baii exortas.—BAYLE's *Diction.* at the articles BAIUS, in which there is an ample and circumſtantial account of theſe diſputes. DU PIN, *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, tom. xvi. p. 144.—*Hiſtoire de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iii. p. 161.

[g] This is demonſtrated fully by an anonymous writer, in a piece, entitled, *Diſſertation ſur les Bulles contre Baius, ou l'on montre qu'elles ne ſont pas reçues par l'Egliſe*, and publiſhed in two volumes 8vo, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1737.

vicar, whoſe ſagacity, prudence, and knowledge of men and things, never failed him in tranſactions of this nature, wiſely avoided making uſe of the privilege he claimed with ſuch confidence, that he might not inflame the diviſions and animoſities that were already ſubſiſting. And accordingly, in the year 1588, this conteſt was finiſhed, and the ſtorm laid in ſuch a manner, as that the contending parties were left in the quiet poſſeſſion of their reſpective opinions, and ſolemnly prohibited from diſputing, either in public or in private, upon the intricate points that had excited their diviſions. Had the ſucceeding pontifs, inſtead of aſſuming the character of judges in this ambiguous and difficult controverſy, imitated the prudence of SIXTUS V., and impoſed ſilence on the litigious doctors, who renewed afterwards the debates concerning divine grace, the tranquillity and unity of the church of *Rome* would not have been interrupted by ſuch violent diviſions as rage at preſent in its boſom [b].

The controverſies with the Moliniſts.

XL. The Roman church had ſcarcely perceived the fruits of that calm, which the prudence of SIXTUS had reſtored, by ſuppreſſing, inſtead of deciding, the late controverſies, when new commotions, of the ſame nature, but of a much more terrible aſpect, aroſe to diſturb its tranquillity. Theſe were occaſioned by LEWIS MOLINA [i], a

---

[b] See *Apologie Hiſtorique des deux Cenſures de Louvain et de Douay, par M.* GERY, 1688, in 8vo. The famous PASQUER QUENEL was the author of this apology, if we may give credit to the writer of a book, entitled, *Catechiſme Hiſtorique et Dogmatique ſur les Conteſtations de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 104.—See an account of this controverſy in a piece, entitled, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des Controverſes dans l'Egliſe Romaine ſur la Predeſtination et ſur la Grace*; this curious piece is to be found in the fourteenth tome of LE CLERC's *Bibliotheque Univerſelle Hiſtorique*.

[i] From this Spaniſh doctor's name proceeded the well-known denomination of *Moliniſts*, by which thoſe Roman-catholics

Spaniſh Jeſuit, profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity of *Ebora* in *Portugal*, who, in the year 1588, publiſhed a book to ſhew that the *operations of divine grace* were entirely conſiſtent with the *freedom of human will* [k], and who introduced a new kind of hypotheſis, to remove the difficulties attending the doctrines of *predeſtination* and *liberty*, and to reconcile the jarring opinions of *Auguſtinians*, *Thomiſts*, *Semi-Pelagians*, and other contentious divines [l]. This attempt of the ſubtile Spaniſh doctor was ſo offenſive to the Dominicans, who followed St. THOMAS as their theological guide, that they ſounded, throughout the whole kingdom of *Spain*, the alarm of hereſy, and accuſed the Jeſuits of endeavouring to renew the errors of PELAGIUS. This alarm was followed by great commotions, and all things ſeemed to prognoſticate a general flame, when CLEMENT VIII., in

---

tholics are diſtinguiſhed, who ſeem to incline to the doctrines of *grace* and *free-will*, that are maintained in oppoſition to thoſe of AUGUSTINE. Many, however, who differ widely from the ſentiments of MOLINA, are unjuſtly ranked in the claſs of Moliniſts.

[k] The title of this famous book is as follows: *Liberi Arbitrii Concordia cum Gratiæ donis, divina præſcientia, providentia, prædeſtinatione, et reprobatione, auctore Lud. Molina.* This book was firſt publiſhed at *Liſbon*, in folio, in the year 1588. Afterwards, with additions, and in 4to, at *Antwerp*, *Lyons*, *Venice*, and other places, in 1595.—A third edition, ſtill farther augmented, was publiſhed at *Antwerp* in 1609.

☞ [l] MOLINA affirmed, that the *Decree* of predeſtination to eternal glory was founded upon a previous knowledge and conſideration of the merits of the elect; that the grace, from whoſe operation theſe *merits* are derived, is not efficacious by its own intrinſic power only, but alſo by the conſent of our own will, and becauſe it is adminiſtered in thoſe circumſtances in which the Deity, by that branch of his knowledge, which is called *Scientia Media*, foreſees that it will be efficacious. The kind of preſcience, denominated in the ſchool *Scientia Media*, is that foreknowledge of future contingents, that ariſes from an acquaintance with the nature and faculties of rational beings, of the circumſtances in which they ſhall be placed, of the objects that ſhall be preſented to them, and of the influence that theſe circumſtances and objects muſt have on their actions.

the year 1594, impoſed ſilence on the contending parties, promiſing that he himſelf would examine with care and diligence every thing relating to this new debate, in order to decide it in ſuch a manner as might tend to promote the cauſe of truth, and the peace of the church.

The congregation of Aids.

XLI. The pontif was perſuaded that theſe gentle remedies would ſoon remove the diſeaſe, and that, through length of time, theſe heats and animoſities would undoubtedly ſubſide. But the event was far from being anſwerable to ſuch pleaſing hopes. The Dominicans, who had long foſtered a deep-rooted and invincible hatred againſt the Jeſuits, having now a favourable opportunity of venting their indignation, exhauſted their furious zeal againſt the doctrine of MOLINA, notwithſtanding the pacific orders of the papal edict. They fatigued inceſſantly the Spaniſh monarch, PHILIP II., and the Roman pontif, CLEMENT VIII., with their importunate clamours, until at length the latter found himſelf under a neceſſity of aſſembling at *Rome* a ſort of council for the deciſion of this controverſy. And thus commenced, about the beginning of the year 1598, thoſe famous deliberations concerning the conteſts of the Jeſuits and Dominicans, which were held in what was called the congregation *de auxiliis*, or of aids. This congregation was ſo denominated on account of the principal point in debate, which was the efficacy of the aids and ſuccours of divine grace, and its conſultations were directed by LEWIS MADRUSI, biſhop of *Trent*, and one of the college of cardinals, who ſat as preſident in this aſſembly, which was compoſed beſides of three biſhops and ſeven divines choſen out of ſo many different orders. The remaining part of this century was wholly employed by theſe ſpiritual judges in hearing and weighing the arguments alleged in favour of their reſpective opinions,

opinions by the contending parties [m]. The Dominicans maintained, with the greateſt obſtinacy, the doctrine of their patron St. THOMAS, as alone conformable to truth. The Jeſuits, on the other hand, though they did not adopt the religious tenets of MOLINA, thought the honour of their order concerned in this controverſy, on account of the oppoſition ſo publicly made to one of its members, and conſequently uſed their utmoſt endeavours to have the Spaniſh doctor acquitted of the charge of Pelagianiſm, and declared free from any errors of moment. In this they acted according to the true Monaſtic ſpirit, which leads each order to reſent the affronts that are offered to any of its members, as if they had been caſt upon the whole community, and to maintain, at all adventures, the cauſe of every individual monk, as if the intereſts of the ſociety were involved in it.

---

[m] The hiſtory and tranſactions of this *Congregation* are related and illuſtrated by ſeveral writers of different complexions, by Jeſuits, Dominicans, and Janſeniſts. HYACINTH SERRI, a Dominican, publiſhed, under the feigned name of AUGUSTIN LE BLANC, in the year 1700, at *Louvain*, a work entitled, *Hiſtoria Congregationum de auxiliis Gratiæ divinæ*; which was anſwered by another hiſtory of theſe debates compoſed by LIV. DE MEYER, a Jeſuit, who aſſumed the name of THEOD. ELEUTHERIUS, in order to lie concealed from public view, and whoſe book is entitled, *Hiſtoria Controverſiarum de Gratiæ divinæ auxiliis*. The Dominicans alſo publiſhed the *Acta congregationum et diſputationum, quæ coram* CLEMENTE VIII., *et* PAULO V., *de auxiliis divinæ Gratiæ ſunt celebratæ*, a work compoſed by THOMAS DE LEMOS, a ſubtile monk of their order, who, in this very *congregation*, had defended with great applauſe the glory of St. THOMAS againſt the Jeſuits.—Amidſt theſe jarring accounts, a man muſt be endowed with a ſupernatural ſagacity to come at the truth. For acts are oppoſed to acts, teſtimony to teſtimony, and narration to narration. It is therefore as yet a matter of doubt, which the court of *Rome* favoured moſt on this occaſion, the Jeſuits or the Dominicans, and which of theſe two parties defended their cauſe with the moſt dexterity and ſucceſs.—There is alſo a hiſtory of theſe debates written in French, which was publiſhed, in 8vo, at *Louvain*, in the year 1702, under the following title; *Hiſtoire de Congregations de auxiliis, par un Docteur de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*. This hiſtorian, though he be neither deſtitute of learning nor elegance, being nevertheleſs a flaming Janſeniſt, diſcovers throughout his enmity againſt the Jeſuits, and relates all things in a manner that favours the cauſe of the Dominicans.

Rites and ceremonies.

XLII. Notwithſtanding the zealous attempts that were made, by ſeveral perſons of eminent piety, to reſtore the inſtitutions of public worſhip to their primitive ſimplicity, the multitude of vain and uſeleſs ceremonies ſtill remained in the church; nor did the pontifs judge it proper to diminiſh that pomp and ſhow, that gave the miniſters of religion a great, though ill-acquired, influence on the minds of the people. Beſides theſe ceremonies, many popular cuſtoms and inventions, which were multiplied by the clergy, and were either entirely abſurd or groſsly ſuperſtitious, called loudly for redreſs; and, indeed, the council of *Trent* ſeemed diſpoſed to correct theſe abuſes, and prevent their farther growth. But this good deſign was never carried into execution; it was abandoned, either through the corrupt prudence of the pope and clergy, who looked upon every check given to ſuperſtition as an attempt to diminiſh their authority, or through their criminal negligence about every thing that tended to promote the true intereſts of religion. Hence it happens, that in thoſe countries where there are few proteſtants, and conſequently where the church of *Rome* is in no danger of loſing its credit and influence from the proximity and attempts of theſe pretended heretics, ſuperſtition reigns with unlimited extravagance and abſurdity. Such is the caſe in *Italy*, *Spain*, and *Portugal*, where the feeble glimmerings of Chriſtianity, that yet remain, are overwhelmed and obſcured by an enormous multitude of ridiculous ceremonies, and abſurd, fantaſtic, and unaccountable, rites; ſo that a perſon who arrives in any of theſe countries, after having paſſed through other nations even of the Romiſh communion, is immediately ſtruck with the change, and thinks himſelf tranſported into the thickeſt darkneſs, into the moſt gloomy retreats, of ſuperſtition [*n*]. Nor, indeed, are even thoſe countries, whom the neighbourhood of the proteſtants, and a more free and liberal turn of mind have rendered ſomewhat leſs abſurd, entirely exempt from the dominion of ſuperſtition, and the ſolemn fooleries that always attend it; for the religion of *Rome*, in its beſt form, and in thoſe places where its external worſhip is the leaſt ſhocking, is certainly loaded with rites and obſervances that are highly offenſive to ſound reaſon. If, from this general view of things, we deſcend to a more circumſtantial conſideration of the innumerable abuſes that are eſtabliſhed in the diſcipline of that church; if we attend to the pious, or rather impious, frauds which are impoſed, with impunity, upon the deluded multitude, in many places; if we paſs in review the corruption of the clergy, the ignorance of the people, the devout farces that are acted in the ceremonies of public worſhip, and the inſipid jargon and trifling rhetoric that prevail in the diſcourſes of the Roman-catholic preachers; if we weigh all theſe things maturely, we ſhall find, that they have little regard to impartiality and truth, who pretend that, ſince the council of *Trent*, the religion and worſhip of the Roman church have been every where corrected and amended.

[*n*] It is well known that the French, who travel into *Italy*, employ the whole force of their wit and raillery in rendering ridiculous the monſtrous ſuperſtition of the Italians. The Italians, in their turn, look upon the French that viſit their country as totally deſtitute of all principles of religion. This is evidently the caſe, as we learn from the teſtimony of many writers, and particularly from that of Father LABAT, in his *Voyages en Italie et en Eſpagne*. This agreeable Dominican lets no opportunity eſcape of cenſuring and expoſing the ſuperſtition of the Spaniards and Italians; nor does he pretend to deny that his countrymen, and even he himſelf, paſſed for impious libertines in the opinion of theſe bigots.

CHAP. II.

The Hiſtory of the Greek *and* Eaſtern CHURCHES.

The eaſtern church may be divided into three branches.

I. THE ſociety of Chriſtians, that goes under the general denomination of the eaſtern church, is diſperſed throughout *Europe*, *Aſia*, and *Africa*, and may be divided into three diſtinct communities. The *firſt* is, that of the Greek Chriſtians, who agree, in all points of doctrine and worſhip, with the patriarch reſiding at *Conſtantinople*, and reject the pretended ſupremacy of the Roman pontif. The *ſecond* comprehends thoſe Chriſtians, who differ equally from the Roman pontif and the Grecian patriarch in their religious opinions and inſtitutions, and who live under the government of their own biſhops and rulers. The *third* is compoſed of thoſe who are ſubject to the ſee of *Rome*.

The Greek church, properly ſpeaking,

II. That ſociety of Chriſtians, that lives in religious communion with the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, is, properly ſpeaking, the Greek, though it aſſumes likewiſe the title of the eaſtern, church. This ſociety is ſubdivided into two branches, of which the one acknowledges the ſupreme authority and juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; while the other, though joined in communion of doctrine and worſhip with that prelate, yet obſtinately refuſes to receive his legates, or to obey his edicts, and is governed by its own laws and inſtitutions, under the juriſdiction of ſpiritual rulers, who are independent on all foreign authority.

III. That

is for the moſt part ſubject to the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*,

III. That part of the Greek church which acknowledges the juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, is divided, as in the early ages of Chriſtianity, into four large diſtricts or provinces, *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jeruſalem*, over every one of which a biſhop preſides with the title of Patriarch, whom the inferior biſhops and monaſtic orders unanimouſly reſpect as their common Father. But the ſupreme chief of all theſe patriarchs, biſhops, and abbots, and, generally ſpeaking, of the whole church, is the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. This prelate has the privilege of nominating the other patriarchs, though that dignity ſtill continues elective, and of approving the election that is made; nor is there any thing of moment undertaken or tranſacted in the church without his expreſs permiſſion, or his eſpecial order. It is true indeed, that, in the preſent decayed ſtate of the Greek churches, whoſe revenues are ſo ſmall, and whoſe former opulence is reduced almoſt to nothing, their ſpiritual rulers enjoy little more than the ſplendid title of *Patriarchs*, without being in a condition to extend their fame, or promote their cauſe, by any undertaking of ſignal importance.

and is divided into four provinces or diſtricts here deſcribed.

IV. The ſpiritual juriſdiction and dominion of the patriarch of *Conſtantinople* are very extenſive, comprehending a conſiderable part of *Greece*, the Grecian *Iſles*, *Wallachia*, *Moldavia*, and ſeveral of the European and Aſiatic provinces that are ſubject to the *Turk*. The patriarch of *Alexandria* reſides generally at *Cairo*, and exerciſes his ſpiritual authority in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, *Lybia*, and part of *Arabia* [o]. DAMASCUS is the principal reſidence of the patriarch of *Antioch*, whoſe juriſdiction extends to *Meſopotamia*, *Syria*, *Cilicia*, and other provinces [p], while the patriarch of *Jeruſalem* comprehends, within the bounds of his pontificate, *Paleſtine*, *Syria* [q], *Arabia*, the country beyond *Jordan*, *Cana in Galilee*, and mount *Sion* [r],

---

[o] For an account of the patriarchate of *Alexandria*, and the various prelates who have filled that ſee, it will be proper to conſult SOLLERII *Commentar. de Patriarchis Alexandrinis*, which is prefixed to the fifth volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*, *Menſis*

Menſis Junii; as alſo the *Oriens Chriſtianus* of LE QUIEN, tom. ii. p. 329. The nature of their office, the extent of their authority, and the manner of their creation, are accurately deſcribed by EUS. RENAUDOT, in his *Diſſertatio de Patriarcha Alexandrino*, which is publiſhed in the firſt volume of his *Liturgiæ Orientales*, p. 365.—The Grecian patriarch has, at this day, no biſhops under his juriſdiction; the *chorepiſcopi* or *rural* biſhops alone are ſubject to his authority. All the biſhops acknowledge as their chief the patriarch of the *Monophyſites*, who is, in effect, the patriarch of *Alexandria*.

[p] The Jeſuits have prefixed a particular and learned account of the patriarchs of *Antioch* to the fifth volume of the *Acta SS. Menſis Julii*, in which, however, there are ſome omiſſions and defects. Add to this the account that is given of the diſtrict or dioceſe of the patriarch of *Antioch* by MICH. LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 670. and by BLASIUS TERTIUS, in his *Siria Sacra, ò Deſcrittione Hiſtorico-Geographica delle due Chieſe Patriarchali, Antiocha, et Gieruſalemme*, publiſhed in folio at *Rome*, in the year 1695. There are three biſhops in *Syria* which claim the title and dignity of patriarch of *Antioch*. The *firſt* is the biſhop of the *Melchites*, a name given to the Chriſtians in *Syria*, who follow the doctrine, inſtitutions, and worſhip, of the Greek church; the *ſecond* is the ſpiritual guide of the Syrian *Monophyſites*; and the *third* is the chief of the *Maronites*, who hold communion with the church of *Rome*. This laſt biſhop pretends to be the true and lawful patriarch of *Antioch*, and is acknowledged as ſuch, or at leaſt receives this denomination from the Roman pontif. And yet it is certain, that the pope creates at *Rome*, a patriarch of *Antioch* of his own choice. So that the ſee of *Antioch* has, at this day, four patriarchs, one from the Greeks, two from the Syrians, and one created at *Rome*, who is patriarch *in partibus*, i. e. titular patriarch, according to the ſignification of that uſual phraſe.

☞ [q] *Syria* is here erroneouſly placed in the patriarchate of *Jeruſalem*, as it evidently belongs to that of *Antioch*, in which alſo Dr. MOSHEIM places it in the preceding ſentence.

[r] BLAS. TERTII *Siria Sacra*, lib. ii. p. 165.—D. PAPEPROCHII *Comment. de Patriarch. Hieroſolym.* tom. iii. *Actor. Sanct. Menſ. Maii.*—LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſt.* tom. iii. p. 102.

The epiſcopal dominions of theſe three patriarchs are indeed extremely poor and inconſiderable; for the Monophyſites have long ſince aſſumed the patriarchal ſeats of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and have deprived the Greek churches of the greateſt part of their members in all thoſe places where they gained an aſcendant. And as *Jeruſalem* is the reſort of Chriſtians of every ſect, who have their reſpective biſhops and rulers, the juriſdiction of the Grecian patriarch is conſequently confined there within narrow limits.

The patriarch of Conſtantinople.

V. The right of electing the patriarch of *Conſtantinople* is, at this day, veſted in the twelve biſhops who reſide neareſt that famous capital; but the right of confirming this election, and of enabling the new-choſen patriarch to exerciſe his ſpiritual functions, belongs only to the Turkiſh emperor. This inſtitution, however, if it is not entirely overturned, is nevertheleſs, on many occaſions, proſtituted in a ſhameful manner by the corruption and avarice of the reigning miniſters. Thus it happens, that many biſhops, inflamed with the ambitious luſt of power and pre-eminence, purchaſe by money what they cannot obtain by merit; and ſeeing themſelves excluded from the patriarchal dignity by the ſuffrages of their brethren, find an open and ready way to it by the mercenary ſervices of men in power. Nay, what is yet more deplorable has frequently happened; even that prelates, who have been choſen in the lawful way to this eminent office, have been depoſed, in order to make way for others, whoſe only pretenſions were ambition and bribery. And indeed, generally ſpeaking, he is looked upon by the Turkiſh vizirs as the moſt qualified for the office of patriarch, who ſurpaſſes his competitors in the number and value of the preſents he employs on that occaſion. It is true, ſome accounts worthy of credit repreſent the preſent ſtate of the

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART I.

Greek church as advantageouſly changed in this reſpect; and it is reported, that, as the Turkiſh manners have gradually aſſumed a milder and more humane caſt, the patriarchs live under their dominion with more ſecurity and repoſe than they did ſome ages ago [*s*].

The power of the patriarch among a people diſpirited by oppreſſion, and ſunk, through their extreme ignorance, into the greateſt ſuperſtition, muſt undoubtedly be very conſiderable and extenſive; and ſuch, indeed, it is. Its extent, however, is not entirely owing to the cauſes now mentioned, but to others that give no ſmall weight and luſtre to the patriarchal dignity. For this prelate does not only call councils by his own authority, in order to decide, by their aſſiſtance, the controverſies that ariſe, and to make uſe of their prudent advice and wiſe deliberations in directing the affairs of the church; his prerogatives go yet farther, and, by the ſpecial permiſſion of the emperor, he adminiſters juſtice and takes cognizance of civil cauſes among the members of his communion. His influence is maintained, on the one hand, by the authority of the Turkiſh monarch, and, on the other, by his right of excommunicating the diſobedient members of the Greek church. This right gives the patriarch a ſingular degree of influence and authority, as nothing has a more terrifying aſpect to that people than a ſentence of excommunication, which they reckon among the greateſt and moſt tremendous evils. The revenue of this prelate is drawn particularly from the churches that are ſubject to his juriſdiction; and its produce varies according to the ſtate and circumſtances of the

---

[*s*] LE QUIEN, ibid. tom. i. p. 145.—ELSNER, *Beſchreibung der Griechiſchen Chriſten in der Turckey*, p. 54.

Greek Chriſtians, whoſe condition is expoſed to many viciſſitudes [t].

The doctrine of the Greek church.

VI. The holy ſcriptures and the decrees of the firſt ſeven *general* councils are acknowledged by the Greeks as the rule of their faith. It is received, however, as a maxim eſtabliſhed by long cuſtom, that no private perſon has a right to explain, for himſelf or others, either the declarations of ſcripture, or the deciſions of theſe councils; and that the patriarch, with his brethren, are alone authoriſed to conſult theſe oracles, and to declare their meaning. And, accordingly, the declarations of this prelate are looked upon as ſacred and infallible directions, whoſe authority is ſupreme, and which can neither be tranſgreſſed nor diſregarded without the utmoſt impiety. The ſubſtance of the doctrine of the Greek church is contained in a treatiſe, entitled, *The Orthodox Confeſſion of the Catholic and Apoſtolic Eaſtern Church*, which was drawn up by Peter Mogislaus, biſhop of *Kiow*, in a provincial council aſſembled in that city. This confeſſion was tranſlated into Greek [u], and publicly approved and adopted, in the year 1643, by Parthenius of *Conſtantinople*, and all the other Grecian patriarchs. It was afterwards publiſhed in Greek and Latin at the expence of Panagiota, the Turkiſh emperor's interpreter, a man of great opulence and liberality, who ordered it to be diſtributed *gratis* among the Greek Chriſtians;

---

[t] Ceper, a Jeſuit, has given a *Hiſtory of the Patriarchs of Conſtantinople*, in the *Acta Sanctorum Menſis Auguſti*, tom. i, p. 1—257. There is alſo a very ample account both of the ſee of *Conſtantinople* and its patriarchs, in the firſt volume of the *Oriens Chriſtianus* of Mich. Le Quien, who treats moreover of the Latin patriarchs of that city, in the third volume of the ſame work, p. 786. See alſo a brief account of the power and revenues of the preſent patriarch, and of the names of the ſeveral ſees under his ſpiritual juriſdiction, in Smith, *De Eccleſ. Græcæ Hodierno Statu*, p. 48—59.

[u] It was originally compoſed in the Ruſſian language.

and it was alſo enriched with a recommendatory letter compoſed by NECTARIUS, patriarch of *Jeruſalem* [w]. It appears evidently from this confeſſion, that the Greeks differ widely from the votaries of the Roman pontif, whoſe doctrines they reject and treat with indignation in ſeveral places; but it appears, at the ſame time, that their religious tenets are equally remote from thoſe of other Chriſtian ſocieties. So that whoever peruſes this treatiſe with attention, will be fully convinced, how much certain writers are miſtaken, who imagine that the obſtacles which prevent the union of the Greeks with this or the other Chriſtian community, are but ſmall and inconſiderable [x].

---

[w] This *confeſſion* was publiſhed in 8vo, at *Leipſic*, with a Latin tranſlation, by LAUR. NORMANNUS, in the year 1695. In the preface we are informed, that it had been compoſed by NECTARIUS: but this aſſertion is refuted by NECTARIUS himſelf, in a letter which follows immediately the preface. It is alſo affirmed, both in the Preface and Title-page, that this is the firſt public edition that has been given of the Greek confeſſion. But this aſſertion is alſo falſe; ſince it is well known that it was publiſhed in *Holland*, in the year 1662, at the expence of PANAGIOTA. The German tranſlation of this confeſſion was publiſhed at *Francfort* and *Leipſic*, in 4to, in 1727. The learned JO. CHRIST. KOCHERUS has given, with his uſual accuracy and erudition, an ample account both of this and the other confeſſions received among the Greeks, in his *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbol.* p. 45 & 53. and the laborious Dr. HOFFMAN, principal Profeſſor of Divinity at *Wittemberg*, publiſhed at *Breſlaw*, in 1751, a new edition of the *Orthodox Confeſſion*, with an hiſtorical account of it. Thoſe who are deſirous of a circumſtantial account of the famous PANAGIOTA, to whom this confeſſion is indebted for a conſiderable part of its credit, and who has rendered to the Greek church in general the moſt eminent ſervices, will find it in CANTEMIR's *Hiſtoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. iii. p. 149.

[x] The learned FABRICIUS has given, in the tenth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 441. an exact and ample liſt of the writers, whom it is proper to conſult, in order to the forming a juſt notion of the ſtate, circumſtances, and doctrines, of the Greek church.

VII. The

The deſign of uniting the Greeks with the proteſtants miſcarries.

VII. The votaries of *Rome* have found this to be true on many occaſions. And the Lutherans made an experiment of the ſame kind, when they preſented a fruitleſs invitation to the Greek churches to embrace their doctrine and diſcipline, and live with them in religious communion. The firſt ſteps in this laudable attempt were taken by MELANCTHON, who ſent to the patriarch of *Conſtantinople* a copy of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, tranſlated into Greek by PAUL DOLSCIUS. This preſent was accompanied with a letter, in which the learned and humane profeſſor of *Wittemberg* repreſented the proteſtant doctrine with the utmoſt ſimplicity and faithfulneſs, hoping that the artleſs charms of truth might touch the heart of the Grecian prelate. But his hopes were diſappointed; for the patriarch did not even deign to ſend him an anſwer [y]. After this, the divines of *Tubingen* renewed, with his ſucceſſor JEREMIAH [z], the correſpondence which had been begun by MELANCTHON. They wrote frequently, during the courſe of ſeveral years [a], to the new patriarch, ſent him another copy of the *confeſſion* of *Augſburg*, together with a *Compend of Theology*, compoſed by HEERBRAND, and tranſlated into Greek by MARTIN CRUSIUS; nor did they leave unemployed any means, which a pious and well-conducted zeal could ſuggeſt as proper to gain over this prelate to their communion. The fruits, however, of this correſpondence were very inconſiderable, and wholly conſiſted in a few letters from the Greek patriarch, written, indeed, with an amiable ſpirit of benevolence and cordiality; but at the ſame time in terms which ſhewed the impoſſibility of the union ſo much deſired by the proteſtants. The whole ſtrain of theſe letters diſcovered in the Greeks an inviolable attachment to the opinions and inſtitutions of their anceſtors, and was ſufficient to demonſtrate the vanity of attempting to diſſolve it in the preſent ſituation and circumſtances of that people [*b*].

---

[y] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua Conſenſione Eccleſiæ Orient. et Occident.* lib. iii. cap. viii. § ii. p. 1005.

☞ [z] The name of the former patriarch was JOSEPH. In the year 1559, he had ſent his Deacon DEMETRIUS to *Wittemberg* to inform himſelf upon the ſpot of the genius and doctrines of the proteſtant religion.

[a] This correſpondence commenced in the year 1576, and ended in 1581.

The miſerable ſtate of the Greeks.

VIII. Nothing, indeed, more deplorable can be conceived than the ſtate of the greateſt part of the Greeks, ſince their ſubjection to the oppreſſive yoke of the Turkiſh emperors. Since that fatal period, almoſt all learning and ſcience, human and divine, had been extinguiſhed among them. They have neither ſchools, colleges, nor any of thoſe literary eſtabliſhments that ennoble human nature, by ſowing in the mind the immortal ſeeds of knowledge and virtue. Thoſe few that ſurpaſs the vulgar herd in intellectual acquirements, have derived this advantage from the ſchools of learning in *Sicily* or *Italy*, where the ſtudious Greeks uſually repair in queſt of knowledge, or from a peruſal of the writings of the ancient doctors, and more eſpecially of the theology of St. THOMAS, which they have tranſlated into their native language [*c*].

Such, at leaſt, is the notion of the learning of the modern Greeks, that is entertained by all the

---

[*b*] All the *Acts* and *Papers*, relating to this correſpondence, were publiſhed in one volume at *Wittemberg*, in the year 1584. See CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Liber de Actis et Scriptis publicis Eccleſiæ Wittembergicæ*, p. 50.—See alſo JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græcæ*, vol. x. p. 517.—EMMAN. A SCHELSTRATE, *Acta Eccleſiæ Orientalis contra Lutheri hæreſin*, publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1739.—LAMI *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, tom. viii. p. 176.

☞ [*c*] The tranſlator has inſerted the note [*k*] of the original into the following paragraph of the Engliſh text, which begins thus: *Such, at leaſt*, &c.

European Chriſtians, as well Roman-catholics as proteſtants, and it is built upon the cleareſt evidence, and ſupported by teſtimonies of every kind. Many of the Greeks deny with obſtinacy this inglorious charge, and not only defend their countrymen againſt the imputation of ſuch groſs ignorance, but even go ſo far as to maintain, that all the liberal arts and ſciences are in as flouriſhing a ſtate in modern *Greece*, as they were in any period of the hiſtory of that nation. Among the writers that exalt the learning of the modern Greeks in ſuch an extraordinary manner, the firſt place is due to an eminent hiſtorian [*d*], who has taken much pains to demonſtrate the error of thoſe who are of a different opinion. For this purpoſe he has not only compoſed a liſt of the learned men that adorned that country in the laſt century, but alſo makes mention of an academy founded at *Conſtantinople* by a certain Greek, whoſe name was MANOLAX, in which all the branches of philoſophy, as well as the liberal arts and ſciences, are taught with the utmoſt ſucceſs and applauſe, after the manner of the ancient ſages of *Greece*. But all this, though matter of fact, does by no means amount to a ſatisfactory proof of the point in queſtion. It only proves, what was never doubted by any thinking perſon, that the populous nation of the Greeks, in which there is ſuch a conſiderable number of ancient, noble, and opulent, families, is not entirely deſtitute of men of learning and genius. But it does not at all demonſtrate, that this nation, conſidered in general, is at preſent enriched with ſcience either ſacred or profane, or makes any ſhining figure in the republic of letters. In a nation which, generally ſpeaking, is ſunk in the moſt barbarous ignorance, ſome men of genius and learning may ariſe, and ſhine like meteors in a gloomy firmament. With reſpect to the academy founded at *Conſtantinople*, it may be obſerved, that a literary eſtabliſhment, ſo neceſſary and yet ſo recent, confirms the judgment that has been almoſt univerſally formed concerning the erudition of the Greeks.

[*d*] See DEM. CANTEMIR, *Hiſtoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. ii. p. 38.

This ignorance, that reigns among the Greeks, has the moſt pernicious influence upon their morals. Licentiouſneſs and impiety not only abound among the people, but alſo diſhonour their leaders; and the calamities that ariſe from this corruption of manners, are deplorably augmented by their endleſs contentions and diviſions. Their religion is a motley collection of ceremonies, the greateſt part of which are either ridiculouſly trifling, or ſhockingly abſurd. Yet they are much more zealous in retaining and obſerving theſe ſenſeleſs rites, than in maintaining the doctrine, or obeying the precepts, of the religion they profeſs. Their miſery would be extreme, were it not for the ſupport they derive from the Greeks, who perform the functions of phyſicians and interpreters at the emperor's court; and who, by their opulence and credit, frequently interpoſe to reconcile the differences, or to ward off the dangers, that ſo often portend the deſtruction of their church.

The Greek church independent on foreign juriſdiction.

IX. The *Ruſſians*, *Georgians*, and *Mingrelians*, adopt the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church; though they are entirely free from the juriſdiction and authority of the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. It is true, indeed, that this prelate had formerly enjoyed the privilege of a ſpiritual ſupremacy over the Ruſſians, to whom he ſent a biſhop whenever a vacancy happened. But, towards the concluſion of this century, this privilege ceaſed by the following incident. JEREMIAH, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, undertook a journey into *Moſcovy*, to levy pecuniary ſuccours, againſt his rival METROPHANES, and to drive him, by the force of money, from the patriarchal throne. On this occaſion, the Moſcovite monks, in compliance, no doubt, with the ſecret orders of the Grand Duke THEODORE, the ſon of JOHN BASILIDES, employed all the influence both of threatenings and ſupplications to engage JEREMIAH to place at the head of the Moſcovite nation an independent patriarch. The patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, unable to reſiſt ſuch powerful ſolicitations, was forced to yield; and accordingly, in a council aſſembled at *Moſcow* in the year 1589, nominated and proclaimed JOB, archbiſhop of *Roſtow*, the firſt patriarch of the Moſcovites. This extraordinary ſtep was, however, taken on condition that every new patriarch of the Ruſſians ſhould demand the conſent and ſuffrage of the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and pay, at certain periods fixed for that purpoſe, five hundred gold ducats. The tranſactions of this Moſcovite council were afterwards ratified in one aſſembled by JEREMIAH at *Conſtantinople* in the year 1593, to which ratification the Turkiſh emperor gave his ſolemn conſent [e]. But the privileges and immunities of the patriarch of *Moſcow* were ſtill farther extended about the middle of the following age, when the four eaſtern patriarchs, under the pontificate of DIONYSIUS II., patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, exempted him, at the renewed ſolicitation of the Grand Duke of *Moſcovy*, from the double obligation of paying tribute, and of depending, for the confirmation of his election and inſtallation, on a foreign juriſdiction [*f*].

---

[e] See ANTON. POSSEVINI *Moſcovia*—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1292.—See alſo a relation of this tranſaction, which is publiſhed in the *Catalogus Codic. MSS. Biblioth. Taurinenſ.* p. 433—469.

The Georgians and Mingrelians.

X. The *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, or, as they were anciently called, the *Iberians* and *Colchians*, have declined ſo remarkably ſince the Mahometan dominion has been eſtabliſhed in theſe countries, that they can ſcarcely be ranked in the number of Chriſtians. Such, in a more eſpecial manner, is the depraved ſtate of the latter, who wander about in the woods and mountains, and lead a ſavage and undiſciplined life; for among the *Georgians*, or *Iberians*, there are yet ſome remains of religion, morals, and humanity. Theſe nations have a pontif at their head, whom they call *The Catholic*; they have alſo their biſhops and prieſts; but theſe ſpiritual rulers are a diſhonour to Chriſtianity, by their ignorance, avarice, and proflicacy; they ſurpaſs almoſt the populace in the corruption of their manners, and, groſsly ignorant themſelves of the truths and principles of religion, they never entertain the leaſt thought of inſtructing the people. If therefore it be affirmed, that the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians*, at this day, are neither attached to the opinions of the *Monophyſites*, nor to thoſe of the *Neſtorians*, but embrace the doctrine of the Greek church, this muſt be affirmed rather in conſequence of probable conjecture, than of certain knowledge; ſince it is impoſſible almoſt to know, with any degree of preciſion, what are the ſentiments of a people who ſeem to lie in the thickeſt darkneſs. Any remains of religion that are obſervable among them, are entirely comprehended in certain ſacred feſtivals and external ceremonies, of which the former are celebrated, and the latter are performed, without the leaſt appearance of decency; ſo that the prieſts adminiſter the ſacraments of baptiſm and of the Lord's ſupper with as little reſpect and devotion, as if they were partaking of an ordinary repaſt [g].

[*f*] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. i. p. 155.—NIC. BERGIUS, *De Eccleſia Muſcovitica*, par. I. ſect. I. c. xviii. p. 164.

Of the eaſtern churches that ſeparate from the communion of the Greeks and Latins.

XI. The eaſtern Chriſtians, who renounce the communion of the Greek church, and differ from it both in doctrine and worſhip, may be comprehended under two diſtinct claſſes. To the former belong the *Monophyſites*, or *Jacobites*, ſo called from JACOB ALBARDAI [h], who declare it as their opinion, that in the Saviour of the world there is only *one nature*; while the latter comprehends the followers of NESTORIUS, frequently called *Chaldæans*, from the country where they principally reſide; and who ſuppoſe that there are two diſtinct *perſons* or *natures* in the Son of God. The *Monophyſites* are ſubdivided into two ſects or parties, the one African, the other Aſiatic. At the head of the *Aſiatics* is the patriarch of *Antioch*, who reſides, for the moſt part, in the monaſtery of St. ANANIAS, which is ſituated near the city of *Merdin*, and ſometimes at *Merdin*, his epiſcopal ſeat, as alſo at *Amida*, *Aleppo*, and other *Syrian* cities [i]. The government of this prelate is too extenſive, and the churches over which he preſides too numerous, to admit of his performing, himſelf, all the duties of his high office; and therefore a part of the adminiſtration of the pontificate is given to a kind of colleague, who is called the *maphrian* or *primate* of the Eaſt, and whoſe doctrine and diſcipline are ſaid to be adopted by the eaſtern churches beyond the *Tigris*. This primate uſed formerly to reſide at *Tauris*, a city on the frontiers of *Armenia*; but his preſent habitation is the monaſtery of St. MATTHEW, which is in the neighbourhood of *Mouſul*, a city of *Meſopotamia*. It is farther obſervable, that all the patriarchs of the *Jacobites* aſſume the denomination of IGNATIUS [k].

---

[g] CLEMENT. GALLANUS, *Conciliatio Eccleſiæ Armenic. cum Romana*, tom. i. p. 156.—CHARDIN, *Voyage en Perſe*, &c. tom. i. p. 67. where the reader will find JOS. MAR. ZAMPI's *Relation de la Colchide et Mingrelie.*—LAMBERTI *Relation de la Colchide ou Mingrelie*, in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tom. vii. p. 160. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1333. 1339.—See alſo RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire Critique des dogmes et ceremonies des Chretiens Orientaux*, ch. v & vi. p. 71. in which the learned author endeavours to remove, at leaſt, a part of the reproach under which the *Georgians* and *Mingrelians* labour on account of their ſuppoſed ignorance and corruption. The *catholics* or pontifs of *Georgia* and *Mingrelia* are, at this day, independent on any foreign juriſdiction; they are, however, obliged to pay a certain tribute to the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*.

☞ [h] This JACOB ALBARDAI, or BARADÆUS as he is called by others, reſtored, in the ſixth century, the ſect of the *Monophyſites*, which was almoſt expiring, to its former vigour, and modelled it anew; hence they were called *Jacobites*. This denomination is commonly uſed in an extenſive ſenſe, as comprehending all the *Monophyſites*, excepting thoſe of *Armenia*; it however more ſtrictly and properly belongs only to thoſe Aſiatic Monophyſites, of which JACOB ALBARDAI was the reſtorer and the chief. See SIMON, *Hiſtoire de Chretiens Orientaux*, ch. ix. p. 118. a work, nevertheleſs, that often wants correction.

The Copts and Abyſſinians.

XII. The African *Monophyſites* are under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Alexandria*, who generally reſides at *Grand Cairo*, and they are ſubdivided into *Copts* and *Abyſſinians*. The denomination of *Copts* comprehends all thoſe Chriſtians who dwell in *Egypt*, *Nubia*, and the countries adjacent, and whoſe condition is truly deplorable. Oppreſſed by the inſatiable avarice and tyranny of the Turks, they draw out their wretched days in miſery and want, and are unable to ſupport either their patriarch or their biſhops. Theſe are not, however, left entirely deſtitute; ſince they are, in a manner, maintained by the liberality of thoſe *Copts*, who, on account of their capacity in houſehold affairs, and their dexterity in the exerciſe of ſeveral manual arts, highly uſeful, though entirely unknown to the Turks, have gained admittance into the principal Mahometan families [*l*]. As to the *Abyſſinians*, they ſurpaſs conſiderably the *Copts* both in their numbers, their power, and their opulence; nor will this appear ſurpriſing, when it is conſidered, that they live under the dominion of a Chriſtian emperor; they, nevertheleſs, conſider the Alexandrian pontif as their ſpiritual parent and chief, and conſequently, inſtead of chuſing their own biſhop, receive from that prelate a *primate*, whom they call *abbuna*, and whom they acknowledge as their ghoſtly ruler [*m*].

---

[i] ASSEMANNI *Diſſert. de Monophyſ.* tom. ii.—*Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatican.* § viii.—FAUST. NAIRON, *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum Monument.* par. I. p. 40.—LE QUIEN *Oriens Chriſt.* tom. ii. p. 1343.

[k] ASSEMANNI *Diſſertat. de Monophyſitis*, § viii.

The religious doctrines and rites of the Monophyſites.

XIII. Theſe Monophyſites differ from other Chriſtian ſocieties, whether of the Greek or Latin communion, in ſeveral points both of doctrine and worſhip; though the principal reaſon of their ſeparation lies in the opinion they entertain concerning the *nature* and *perſon* of JESUS CHRIST.

[*l*] RENAUDOT publiſhed at *Paris*, in 4to, in the year 1713, a very learned work, relative to the Hiſtory of the Eaſtern Patriarchs, under the title of *Hiſtoria Alexandrinorum Patriarcharum Jacobitarum*, &c. He alſo publiſhed the *Office* uſed in the ordination of the Jacobite Patriarch, with remarks, in the firſt volume of his *Liturgiæ Orient.* p. 467.—The internal ſtate of the *Alexandrian* or *Coptic* church, both with reſpect to doctrine and worſhip, is deſcribed by WANSLEB, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe d'Alexandrie, que nous appellons celle de Jacobites Coptes*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 1667. Add to this another work of the ſame author, entituled, *Relation d'un Voyage en Egypte*, p. 293. in which there is a particular account of the *Coptic* monaſteries and religious orders. See alſo *Nouveaux Memoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus dans le Levant*, tom. ii. p. 9.—MALLET, *Deſcription de l'Egypte*, tom. ii. p. 64.

[*m*] JOB LUDOLF, *Comment. in Hiſtor. Æthiop.* p. 451. 461. 466.—LOBO, *Voyage d'Abiſſinia*, tom. ii. p. 36.—*Nouveaux Memoires des Miſſions dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 277.—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 641.

Following the doctrine of DIOSCORUS, BARSUMA, XENAIAS, FULLO, and others, whom they conſider as the heads or chief ornaments of their ſect, they maintain that in CHRIST the *divine* and *human nature* were reduced into *one*, and conſequently reject both the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*, and the famous letter of LEO the Great. That, however, they may not ſeem to have the leaſt inclination towards the doctrine of EUTYCHES, which they profeſs to reject with the moſt ardent zeal, they propoſe their own ſyſtem with the utmoſt caution and circumſpection, and hold the following obſcure principles: That the *two natures* are *united* in CHRIST without either *confuſion* or *mixture*; ſo that though the nature of our Saviour be really *one*, yet it is at the ſame time *twofold* and *compound* [n]. By this declaration it appears, that thoſe learned men, who look upon the difference between the *Monophyſites* and the Greek and Latin churches, rather as a diſpute about *words* than *things*, are not ſo far miſtaken as ſome have imagined [o]. Be that as it may, both the Aſiatic and African Monophyſites of the preſent times are, generally ſpeaking, ſo deeply ſunk in ignorance, that their attachment to the doctrine by which they are diſtinguiſhed from other Chriſtian ſocieties, is rather founded on their own obſtinacy, and on the authority of their anceſtors, than on any other circumſtance; nor do they even pretend to appeal, in its behalf, to reaſon and argument [*p*].

---

[n] ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26. 29. 34. 117. 133. 135. 277. 297, &c.—See, in the ſame work, ABULPHARAGE'S *Subtile Vindication of the Doctrine of his Sect*, vol. ii. p. 288. There is a complete and circumſtantial account of the religion of the Abyſſinians, in the *Theologia Æthiopica* of GREGORY the Abyſſinian, publiſhed by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, p. 716. where there is alſo a liſt of all the writers who have given accounts of the Abyſſinians.

[o] See LA CROZE, *Hiſt. du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*, p. 23. ASSEMANNI *loc. citat.* tom. ii. p. 291. 297.—RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire des Chretiens Orientaux*, p. 119.—JO. JOACH. SCHRODERI *Theſaurus Linguæ Armenicæ*, p. 276. ☞ The truth of the matter is, that the terms uſed by the Monophyſites are ſomething more than equivocal; they are contradictory. It may alſo be farther obſerved, that thoſe who pretend to hold a middle path between the doctrines of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, were greatly embarraſſed, as it was almoſt impoſſible to oppoſe the one, without adopting, or at leaſt appearing to adopt, the other.

The Armenians.

XIV. The Armenians [*q*], though they agree with the other *Monophyſites* in the main doctrine of that ſect relating to the *unity* of the divine and human nature in CHRIST, differ from them, nevertheleſs, in many points of faith, diſcipline, and worſhip; and hence it comes to paſs, that they hold no communion with that branch of the Monophyſites, who are *Jacobites* in the more limited ſenſe of that term. The Armenian church is governed by three patriarchs [*r*]. The chief of

---

[*p*] The liturgies of the Copts, the Syrian Jacobites, and the Abyſſinians, have been publiſhed, with learned obſervations, by RENAUDOT, in the firſt and ſecond volumes of his *Liturgiæ Orientales*.

[*q*] The firſt writer, who gave a circumſtantial account of the religion and hiſtory of the Armenians, was CLEMENT GALANI, an Italian of the order of the *Theatins*, whoſe *Conciliatio Eccleſiæ Armenicæ cum Romana*, was publiſhed at *Rome*, in three volumes in folio, in the year 1650. The other authors, who have treated of this branch of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, ch. xxxviii. p. 640.; to which muſt be added, LE QUIEN *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1362.—The *Hiſtory of Chriſtianity in Armenia*, which the learned LA CROZE has ſubjoined to his account of the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion in *Abyſſinia*, and which was publiſhed at the *Hague* in 1739, is by no means anſwerable to the importance and copiouſneſs of the ſubject; which muſt be attributed to the age and infirmities of that author. For an account of the particular inſtitutions and rites of the Armenians, ſee GEMELLI CARRERI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 146.

☞ [*r*] Sir PAUL RICAUT mentions four; but his authority, were it more reſpectable than it really is, cannot be compared with that of the excellent ſources from whence Dr. MOSHEIM draws his materials.

theſe, whoſe dioceſe comprehends the *Greater Armenia*, beholds forty-two archbiſhops ſubjected to his juriſdiction, and reſides in a monaſtery at a place called *Echmiazin*. The revenues of this ſpiritual ruler are ſuch as would enable him to live in the moſt ſplendid and magnificent manner [*s*]; but there is no mark of pomp or opulence in his external appearance, nor in his domeſtic œconomy. His table is frugal, his habit plain; nor is he diſtinguiſhed from the monks, with whom he lives, by any other circumſtance than his ſuperior power and authority. He is, for the moſt part, elected to his patriarchal dignity by the ſuffrages of the biſhops aſſembled at *Echmiazin*, and his election is confirmed by the ſolemn approbation of the Perſian monarch. The ſecond patriarch of the Armenians, who is called *The Catholic*, reſides at *Cis*, a city of *Cilicia*, rules over the churches eſtabliſhed in *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Cyprus*, and *Syria*, and hath twelve archbiſhops under his juriſdiction. He alſo at preſent acknowledges his ſubordination to the patriarch of *Echmiazin*. The third and laſt in rank of the patriarchs above mentioned, who has no more than eight or nine biſhops under his dominion, reſides in the iſland of *Aghtamar*, which is in the midſt of the Great Lake of *Varaſpuracan*, and is looked upon by the other Armenians as the enemy of their church.

Beſides theſe prelates, who are patriarchs in the true ſenſe of that term, the Armenians have other ſpiritual leaders, who are honoured with the title of Patriarchs; but this, indeed, is no more than an empty title, unattended with the authority and prerogatives of the patriarchal dignity. Thus the archbiſhop of the Armenians, who lives at *Conſtantinople*, and whoſe authority is reſpected by the churches eſtabliſhed in thoſe provinces that form the connexion between *Europe* and *Aſia*, enjoys the title of Patriarch. The ſame denomination is given to the Armenian biſhop who reſides at *Jeruſalem*; and to the prelate of the ſame nation, who has his epiſcopal ſeat at *Caminec* in *Poland*, and governs the Armenian churches that are eſtabliſhed in *Ruſſia*, *Poland*, and the adjacent countries. Theſe biſhops aſſume the title of Patriarchs, on account of ſome peculiar privileges conferred on them by the Great Patriarch of *Echmiazin*. For by an authority derived from this ſupreme head of the Armenian church, they are allowed to conſecrate biſhops, and to make, every third year, and diſtribute among their congregations, the holy *chriſm* or ointment, which, according to a conſtant cuſtom among the eaſtern Chriſtians, is the privilege of the patriarchs alone [*t*].

[*s*] R. SIMON has ſubjoined to his *Hiſtoire de Chretiens Orient.* p. 217. an account of all the Armenian churches that are ſubject to the juriſdiction of this grand patriarch. But this account, though taken from USCANUS, an Armenian biſhop, is nevertheleſs defective in many reſpects. For an account of the reſidence and manner of life of the patriarch of ECHMIAZIN, ſee PAUL LUCAS *Voyage au Levant*, tom. ii. p. 247, and GEMELLI CARRERI *Voyage du tour du monde*, tom. ii. p. 4—10.

The Neſtorians, or Chaldeans.

XV. The *Neſtorians*, who are alſo known by the denomination of *Chaldeans*, have fixed their habitations chiefly in *Meſopotamia* and the adjacent countries. They have ſeveral doctrines, as well as ſome religious ceremonies and inſtitutions, that are peculiar to themſelves. But the main points, that diſtinguiſh them from all other Chriſtian ſocieties, are, their perſuaſion that Nestorius was unjuſtly condemned by the council of *Epheſus*, and their firm attachment to the doctrine of that prelate, who maintained that there were not only two *natures*, but alſo two diſtinct *perſons* in the Son of God. In the earlier ages of the church, this error was looked upon as of the moſt momentous and pernicious kind; but in our times it is eſteemed of leſs conſequence, by perſons of the greateſt weight and authority in theological matters, even among the Roman-catholic doctors. They conſider this whole controverſy as a diſpute about words, and the opinion of NESTORIUS as a nominal, rather than a real, hereſy; that is, as an error ariſing rather from the words he employed, than from his intention in the uſe of them. It is true indeed, that the Chaldeans attribute to CHRIST two *natures*, and even two *perſons*; but they correct what may ſeem raſh in this expreſſion, by adding, that theſe natures and perſons are ſo cloſely and intimately united, that they have only one *aſpect*. Now the word *barſopa*, by which they expreſs this aſpect, is preciſely of the ſame ſignification with the Greek word προσωπον, which ſignifies a *perſon* [u]; and from hence it is evident, that they attached to the word *aſpect* the ſame idea that we attach to the word *perſon*, and that they underſtood by the word perſon, preciſely what we underſtand by the term *nature*. However that be, we muſt obſerve here, to the laſting honour of the Neſtorians, that, of all the Chriſtian ſocieties eſtabliſhed in the Eaſt, they have been the moſt careful and ſucceſsful in avoiding a multitude of ſuperſtitious opinions and practices that have infected the Greek and Latin churches [*x*].

[*t*] See the *Nouveaux Memoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iii. p. 1—218. where there is an ample and circumſtantial account both of the civil and religious ſtate of the Armenians. This account has been highly applauded by M. de la Croze, for the fidelity, accuracy, and induſtry, with which it is drawn up, and no man was more converſant in ſubjects of this nature than that learned author.—See La Croze, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme d'Ethiopie*, p. 345.

---

[u] It is in this manner that the ſentiments of the Neſtorians are explained in the inſcriptions which adorn the tombs of their patriarchs in the city of *Mouſul*.—See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. II. p. 210.—R. SIMON, *Hiſtoire de la Créance des Chretiens Orientaux*, ch. vii. p. 94.—PETRUS STROZZA, *De dogmatibus Chaldeorum*, publiſhed, in 8vo, at *Rome*, in the year 1617.

Their patriarchs.

XVI. In the earlier ages of Neſtorianiſm the various branches of that numerous and powerful ſect were under the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the ſame pontif, or *catholic*, who reſided firſt at *Bagdat*, and afterwards at *Mouſul*. But in this century the Neſtorians were divided into two ſects. They had choſen, in the year 1552, as has been already obſerved, two biſhops at the ſame time, SIMEON BARMANA and JOHN SULAKA, otherwiſe named SIUD. The latter, to ſtrengthen his intereſt, and to triumph over his competitor, went directly to *Rome*, and acknowledged the juriſdiction, that he might be ſupported by the credit of the Roman pontif. In the year 1555, SIMEON DENHA, archbiſhop of *Gelu*, adopted the party of the fugitive patriarch, who had embraced the communion of the Latin church; and, being afterwards choſen patriarch himſelf, fixed his reſidence in the city of *Ormia*, in the mountainous parts of *Perſia*, where his ſucceſſors ſtill continue, and are all diſtinguiſhed by the name of SIMEON. So far down as the laſt century, theſe patriarchs perſevered in their communion with the church of *Rome*, but ſeem at preſent to have withdrawn themſelves from it [*y*]. The great Neſtorian pontifs, who form the oppoſite party, and look with an hoſtile eye on this little patriarch, have, ſince the year 1559, been diſtinguiſhed by the general denomination of ELIAS, and reſide conſtantly in the city of *Mouſul* [z]. Their ſpiritual dominion is very extenſive, takes in a great part of *Aſia*, and comprehends alſo within its circuit the Arabian Neſtorians; as alſo the CHRISTIANS *of St.* THOMAS, who dwell along the coaſt of *Malabar* [a].

[*x*] See the learned diſſertation of ASSEMANNI *de Syris Neſtorianis*, which occupies entirely the fourth volume of his *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* and which ſeems to have been much conſulted, and partly copied, by MICH. LE QUIEN, in the eleventh volume of his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, p. 1078.

[*y*] See JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 538. & tom. ii. p. 456.

The remains of ancient ſects.

XVII. Beſide the Chriſtian ſocieties now mentioned, who ſtill retained ſome faint ſhadow at leaſt of that ſyſtem of religion delivered by CHRIST and his Apoſtles, there were other ſects diſperſed through a great part of *Aſia*, whoſe principles and doctrines were highly pernicious. Theſe ſects derived their origin from the Ebionites, Valentinians, Manicheans, Baſilidians, and other ſeparatiſts, who, in the early ages of Chiſtianity, excited ſchiſms and factions in the church. Equally abhorred by Turks and Chriſtians, and thus ſuffering oppreſſion from all quarters, they declined from day to day, and fell at length into ſuch barbarous ſuperſtition and ignorance, as extinguiſhed among them every ſpark of true religion. Thus were they reduced to the wretched and ignominious figure they at preſent make, having fallen from the privileges, and almoſt forfeited the very name, of Chriſtians. The ſect, who paſs in the Eaſt under the denomination of *Sabians*, who call themſelves *Mendai*, *Ijabi*, or the *diſciples of* JOHN, and whom the Europeans entitle the *Chriſtians of St.* JOHN, becauſe they yet retain ſome knowledge of the goſpel, is probably of Jewiſh origin, and ſeems to have been derived from the ancient *Hemerobaptiſts*, of whom the writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory make frequent mention [a]. This at leaſt is certain, that that JOHN, whom they conſider as the founder of their ſect, bears no ſort of ſimilitude to JOHN *the Baptiſt*, but rather reſembles the perſon of that name whom the ancient writers repreſent as the chief of the Jewiſh *Hemerobaptiſts* [b]. Theſe ambiguous Chriſtians, whatever their origin be, dwell in *Perſia* and *Arabia*, and principally at *Baſſora*; and their religion conſiſts in bodily waſhings, performed frequently and with great ſolemnity [c], and attended with certain ceremonies which the prieſts mingle with this ſuperſtitious ſervice [d].

---

[z] A liſt of the Neſtorian pontifs is given by ASSEMANNI, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 711. which is corrected, however, in the ſame volume, par. II. p. CML.—See alſo LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 1078.

[a] The reader will find an ample account of the *Chriſtians of St.* THOMAS in LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*.—See alſo ASSEMANNI *loc. citat.* tom. iii. par. II. cap. ix. p. ccccxiii.

XVIII. The

☞ [a] The ſect of *Hemerobaptiſts* among the Jews were ſo called from their waſhing themſelves every day, and their performing this cuſtom with the greateſt ſolemnity, as a religious rite neceſſary to ſalvation. The account of this ſect given by EPIPHANIUS in the introduction to his book of Hereſies, has been treated as a fiction, in conſequence of the ſuſpicions of inaccuracy and want of veracity under which that author too juſtly labours. Nay, the exiſtence of the *Hemerobaptiſts* has been denied, but without reaſon; ſince they are mentioned by JUSTIN MARTYR, EUSEBIUS, and many other ancient writers, every way worthy of credit. That the *Chriſtians of St.* JOHN were deſcended from this ſect, is rendered probable by many reaſons, of which the principal and the moſt ſatiſfactory may be ſeen in a very learned and ingenious work of Dr. MOSHEIM, entitled, MOSHEMII *De Rebus Chriſtianorum ante Conſtantinum Magnum Commentarii*, p. 44.

☞ [b] See the preceding note.

☞ [c] The *Mendæans* at preſent perform theſe ablutions only once in a year. See MOSHEIM, *De Rebus Chriſtian. ante Conſt. Mag. Comment.* p. 45.

[d] See the work of a learned Carmelite, named IGNATIUS A JESU, publiſhed at *Rome*, in 8vo, in the year 1652, under the following title: *Narratio originis rituum et errorum Chriſtianorum S. Johannis: cui adjungitur diſcurſus, per modum Dialogi, in quo confutantur* XXXIV *errores ejuſdem nationis*.—ENGELB. KAEMPFERI *Amœnitates Exoticæ, Faſcic.* II. *Relat.* XI. p. 35.—SALE's *Preface to his Engliſh Tranſlation of the Koran*, p. 15.—ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental.* tom. iii. par. II. p. 609.—THEVENOT, *Voyages*, tom. iv. p. 584.—HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* p. 725.—

The Jaſidians, or Jezdæans.

XVIII. The *Jaſidians*, or *Jezdæans*, of whoſe religion and manners many reports of a very doubtful nature are given by voyage-writers, are an unſettled wandering tribe, who frequent the *Gordian* mountains, and the deſerts of *Curdiſtan*, a province of *Perſia*; the character of whoſe inhabitants has ſomething in it peculiarly fierce and intractable. The Jezdæans are divided into *black* and *white* members. The former are the prieſts and rulers of the ſect, who go arrayed in ſable garments; while the latter, who compoſe the multitude, are cloathed in white. Their ſyſtem of religion is certainly very ſingular, and

is

---

p. 725.—The very learned BAYER had compoſed an hiſtorical account of theſe *Mendæans*, which contained a variety of curious and intereſting facts, and of which he deſigned that I ſhould be the editor, but a ſudden death prevented his executing his intention. He was of opinion (as appears from the *Theſaurus Epiſtolicus Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 21.) that theſe Mendæans, or *diſciples of St.* JOHN, were a branch of the ancient Manicheans; which opinion LA CROZE himſelf ſeems to have adopted, as may be ſeen in the work now cited, tom. iii. p. 31. 52. But there is really nothing, either in the doctrines or manners of this ſect, that reſembles the opinions and practice of the Manicheans. Hence ſeveral learned men conjecture, that they derive their origin from the ancient idolators who worſhipped a plurality of gods, and more eſpecially from thoſe who payed religious adoration to the ſtars of heaven, and who were called, by the Arabians, *Sabians* or *Sabeans* (*Sabini*). This opinion has been maintained with much erudition by the famous FOURMONT, in a *Diſſertation* inſerted in the eighteenth volume of the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, p. 23. But it is abſolutely groundleſs, and has not even a ſhadow of probability, if we except the name which the Mahometans uſually give to this ſect. The Mendæans, themſelves, acknowledge that they are of Jewiſh origin, and that they were tranſlated out of *Paleſtine* into the country they at preſent inhabit. They have ſacred books of a very remote antiquity; among others, one which they attribute to ADAM, and another compoſed by JOHN, whom they revere as the founder of their ſect. As theſe books have been ſome years ago added to the library of the king of *France*, it is to be hoped, that they may contribute to give us a more authentic account of this people than we have hitherto received.

is not hitherto ſufficiently known; though it be evidently compoſed of ſome Chriſtian doctrines, and a motley mixture of fictions drawn from a different ſource. They are diſtinguiſhed from the other corrupt ſects, that have diſhonoured Chriſtianity, by the peculiar impiety of their opinion concerning the evil genius. This malignant principle they call *Karubin* or *Cherubim*, i. e. one of the great miniſters of the Supreme Being. And if they do not directly addreſs religious worſhip to this evil miniſter, they treat him at leaſt with the utmoſt reſpect, and not only abſtain, themſelves, from offering him any marks of hatred or contempt, but moreover will not ſuffer any contumelious treatment to be given him by others. Nay, they are ſaid to carry this reverence and circumſpection to ſuch an exceſſive height, that no efforts of perſecution, no torments, not even death itſelf, can engage them to conceive or expreſs an abhorrence of this evil genius; and that they will make no ſcruple to put to death ſuch perſons as expreſs, in their preſence, an averſion to him [e].

XIX. The

---

[e] See Hyde, *Hiſtoria Relig. Veter. Perſarum in Append.* p. 549.—Otter, *Voyage en Turquie et en Perſe*, tom. i. p. 121. tom. ii. p. 249. In the laſt century, Michael Nau, a learned Jeſuit, undertook to inſtruct this profane ſect, and to give them juſter notions of religion (ſee D'Arvieux, *Memoires ou Voyages*, tom. vi. p. 362. 377.) and after him another Jeſuit, whoſe name was Monier, embarked in the ſame dangerous enterprize (ſee *Memoires des Miſſions des Jeſuites*, tom. iii. p. 291.); but how they were received, and what ſucceſs attended their miniſtry, is hitherto unknown. Rhenferdius, as appears from the letters of the learned Gisbert Cuper, publiſhed by Bayer (ſee p. 30.) conſidered the *Jeſdæans* as the deſcendants of the ancient *Scthians*. But this opinion is no leſs improbable than that which makes them a branch of the Manicheans; which is ſufficiently refuted by their ſentiments concerning the *Evil Genius*. Beausobre, in his *Hiſtoire de Manicheiſme*, tom. ii. p. 613. conjectures that the denomination of this ſect is derived from the name of Jesus; but it ſeems rather to be borrowed from the word *Jazid*, or *Jezdan*, which,

Duruzians, or Durſians.

XIX. The *Duruzians*, or *Durſians*, a fierce and warlike people that inhabit the craggy rocks and inhoſpitable wilds of mount *Libanus*, give themſelves out for deſcendants of the Franks, who, from the eleventh century, carried on the Holy war with the Mahometans in *Paleſtine*; though this pretended origin is a matter of the greateſt uncertainty. What the doctrine and diſcipline of this nation are at preſent, is extremely difficult to know, as they are at the greateſt pains imaginable to conceal their religious ſentiments and principles. We find, however, both in their opinions and practice, the plaineſt proofs of their acquaintance with Chriſtianity. Several learned men have imagined, that both they and the *Curdi* of *Perſia* had formerly embraced the ſentiments of the Manicheans, and perhaps ſtill perſevere in their pernicious errors [*f*].

The *Chamſi*, or *Solares*, who reſide in a certain diſtrict of *Meſopotamia*, are ſuppoſed, by curious inquirers into theſe matters, to be a branch of the *Samſæans* mentioned by EPIPHANIUS [*g*].

There are many other Semi-chriſtian ſects of theſe kinds in the eaſt [*h*], whoſe principles, tenets,

---

which, in the Perſian language, ſignifies the *Good God*, and is oppoſed to *Ahrimne*, or *Arimanius*, the Evil Principle (ſee HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 484.—CHAREFEDDIN ALY, *Hiſt. de Timurbec*, tom. iii. p. 81.), ſo that the term *Jazidans* points out that ſect as the worſhippers of the good or true God. Notwithſtanding the plauſibility of this account of the matter, it is not impoſſible that the city *Jezd*, of which OTTER ſpeaks in his *Voyage en Turquie et en Perſe*, tom. i. p. 283. may have given riſe to the title of *Jaſidians*, or *Jezdæans*.

[*f*] See LUCAS, *Voyages en Grece et Aſie Mineure*, tom. ii. p. 36.—HYDE, *Hiſtor. Relig. Veter. Perſar.* p. 491. 554.—Sir PAUL RICAUT's *Hiſtory of the Ottoman Empire*, vol. i. p. 313.

[*g*] HYDE, *Hiſtor. Relig. Veter. Perſar.* p. 555.

[*h*] See the work of the Jeſuit DIUSSE, entitled, *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuſes des Miſſions Etrangeres*, tom. i. p. 63.

This

tenets, and inſtitutions, are far from being unworthy of the curioſity of the learned. And thoſe who would be at the pains to turn their reſearches this way, and more eſpecially to have the religious books of theſe ſects conveyed into *Europe*, would undoubtedly render eminent ſervice to the cauſe of ſacred literature, and obtain applauſe from all who have a taſte for the ſtudy of Chriſtian antiquities; for the accounts which have hitherto been given of theſe nations and ſects are full of uncertainty and contradiction.

Of the Greeks who embraced the Roman communion.

XX. The miſſionaries of *Rome* have never ceaſed to diſplay in theſe parts of the world their dexterity in making proſelytes, and accordingly have founded, though with great difficulty and expence, among the greateſt part of the ſects now mentioned, congregations that adopt the doctrine, and acknowledge the juriſdiction, of the Roman pontif. It is abundantly known, that, among the Greeks, who live under the empire of the Turk, and alſo among thoſe who are ſubject to the dominion of the Venetians, the emperor of the Romans, and other Chriſtian princes, there are ſeveral who have adopted the faith and diſcipline of the Latin church, and are governed by their own clergy and biſhops, who receive their confirmation and authority from *Rome*. In this latter city there is a college, expreſsly founded with a view to multiply theſe apoſtatizing ſocieties, and to increaſe and ſtrengthen the credit and authority of the Roman pontif among the Greeks. In theſe colleges a certain number of Grecian ſtudents, who have given early marks of genius and capacity, are inſtructed in the arts and ſciences, and are more eſpecially prepoſſeſſed with the deepeſt

---

This author tells us, that in the mountains, which ſeparate *Perſia* from *India*, there lives a ſect of Chriſtians, who imprint the ſign of the croſs on their bodies with a red-hot iron.

ſentiments of veneration and zeal for the authority of the pope. Such an inſtitution, accompanied with the efforts and labours of the miſſionaries, could not fail, one would think, to gain an immenſe number of proſelytes to *Rome*, conſidering the unhappy ſtate of the Grecian churches. But the caſe is quite otherwiſe; for the moſt reſpectable writers, even of the Roman-catholic perſuaſion, acknowledge fairly, that the proſelytes they have drawn from the Greek churches make a wretched and deſpicable figure, in point of number, opulence, and dignity, when compared with thoſe, to whom the religion, government, nay, the very name of *Rome*, are diſguſting and odious. They obſerve farther, that the ſincerity of a great part of theſe proſelytes is of the Grecian ſtamp; ſo that, when a favourable occaſion is offered them of renouncing, with advantage, their pretended converſion, they ſeldom fail, not only to return to the boſom of their own church, but even to recompence the good offices they received from the Romans with the moſt injurious treatment. The ſame writers mention another circumſtance, much leſs ſurpriſing, indeed, than thoſe now mentioned, but much more diſhonourable to the church of *Rome*; and that circumſtance is, that even thoſe of the Greek ſtudents who are educated at *Rome* with ſuch care, as might naturally attach them to its religion and government, are, nevertheleſs, ſo diſguſted and ſhocked at the corruptions of its church, clergy, and people, that they forget, more notoriouſly than others, the obligations with which they have been loaded, and exert themſelves with peculiar obſtinacy and bitterneſs in oppoſing the credit and authority of the Latin church [*i*].

XXI. In

[*i*] See, among other authors who have treated this point of hiſtory, URB. CERRI, *Etat preſent d'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 82. in which,

A junction between the Ruſſian and Roman churches attempted in vain.

XXI. In their efforts to extend the papal empire over the Greek churches, the deſigning pontifs did not forget the church of *Ruſſia*, the chief bulwark and ornament of the Grecian faith. On the contrary, frequent deliberations were held at *Rome*, about the proper methods of uniting, or rather ſubjecting, this church to the papal hierarchy. In this century JOHN BASILIDES, Grand-Duke of the Ruſſians, ſeemed to diſcover a propenſity towards this union, by ſending, in the year 1580, a ſolemn embaſſy to GREGORY XIII., to exhort that pontif to reſume the negociations relative to this important matter, that ſo they might be brought to a happy and ſpeedy concluſion. Accordingly, the year following, ANTONY POSSEVIN, a learned and artful Jeſuit, was charged with this commiſſion by the Roman pontif, and ſent into *Muſcovy* to bring it into execution. But this dexterous miſſionary, though he ſpared no pains to obtain the purpoſes of his ambitious court, found by experience that all his efforts were unequal to the taſk he had undertaken; nor did the Ruſſian ambaſſadors, who arrived at *Rome* ſoon after, bring any thing to the ardent wiſhes of the pontif, but empty promiſes, conceived in dubious and general terms, on which little dependence could be made [k]. And, indeed, the event abundantly ſhewed,

---

which, ſpeaking of the Greeks, he expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: *Ils deviennent les plus violens ennemis des Catholiques lorſqu'ils ont apris nos ſciences, et qu'ils ont connoiſſance de nos* IMPERFECTIONS: *i. e.* in plain Engliſh, *They* (the Greeks) *become the bittereſt enemies of us Roman-catholics, when they have been inſtructed in our ſciences, and have acquired the knowledge of our* IMPERFECTIONS. Other teſtimonies of a like nature ſhall be given hereafter.—MICH. LE QUIEN has given us an enumeration, although a defective one, of the Greek biſhops that follow the rites of the Roman church, in his *Oriens Chriſt.* tom. iii. p. 860.

[k] See the conferences between POSSEVIN and the duke of *Muſcovy*, together with the other writings of this Jeſuit; relative

ſhewed, that BASILIDES had no other view, in all theſe negociations, than to flatter the pope, and obtain his aſſiſtance, in order to bring to an advantageous concluſion the unſucceſsful war, which he had carried on againſt *Poland.*

The miniſtry of POSSEVIN and his aſſociates was, however, attended with more fruit among that part of the Ruſſians who reſide in the Poliſh dominions, many of whom embraced the doctrine and rites of the Roman church, in conſequence of an aſſociation agreed on in the year 1596, in a meeting at *Breſty,* the capital of the Palatinate of *Cujavia.* Thoſe that thus ſubmitted to the communion of *Rome* were called the *United,* while the adverſe party, who adhered to the doctrine and juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Conſtantinople,* were diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *Non-united* [*l*]. It is likewiſe farther worthy of obſervation here, that there has been eſtabliſhed at *Kiovia,* ſince the fourteenth century, a congregation of Ruſſians, ſubject to the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, and ruled by its own *Metropolitans,* who are entirely diſtinct from the Ruſſian biſhops that reſide in that city [*m*].

The votaries of *Rome* ſtill leſs numerous among the Monophyſites, Neſtorians, and Armenians.

XII. The Roman miſſionaries made ſcarcely any ſpiritual conqueſts worthy of mention among either the Aſiatic or African *Monophyſites.* About the middle of the preceding century, a little inſignificant church, that acknowledged the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, was erected among the Neſtorians, whoſe patriarchs, ſucceſſively

---

tive to the negociation in queſtion, that are ſubjoined to his work, called *Moſcovia.*—See alſo *La Vie du P. Poſſevin, par* JEAN DORIGNY, livr. v. p. 351.

[*l*] ADR. REGENVOLSCHII *Hiſtor. Eccleſiar. Slavonicar.* lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 465.

[*m*] See MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus,* tom. i. p. 1274. and tom. iii. p. 1126.—*Acta Sanctorum,* tom. ii. *Februar.* p. 693.

named JOSEPH [*n*], reſide in the city of *Diarbek*. Some of the Armenian provinces embraced the doctrines and diſcipline of *Rome* ſo early as the fourteenth century, under the pontificate of JOHN XXII., who, in the year 1318, ſent them a Dominican monk to govern their church, with the title and authority of an archbiſhop. The epiſcopal ſeat of this ſpiritual ruler was firſt fixed at *Adorbigana*, in the diſtrict of *Soldania* [*o*]; but was afterwards transferred to *Naxivan*, where it ſtill remains in the hands of the Dominicans, who alone are admitted to that ghoſtly dignity [*p*]. The Armenian churches in *Poland*, who have embraced the faith of *Rome*, have alſo their biſhop, who reſides at *Lemberg* [*q*]. The Georgians and Mingrelians, who were viſited by ſome monks of the Theatin and Capuchin orders, diſguſted theſe miſſionaries by their ferocity and ignorance, remained inattentive to their counſels, and unmoved by their admonitions; ſo that their miniſtry and labours were ſcarcely attended with any viſible fruit [*r*].

The labours of the Roman miſſionaries among all theſe ſects produce little fruit.

XXIII. The pompous accounts which the papal miſſionaries have given of the vaſt ſucceſs of their labours among all theſe Grecian ſects, are equally deſtitute of candour and truth. It is evident, from teſtimonies of the beſt and moſt reſpectable authority, that, in ſome of theſe countries, they do nothing more than adminiſter clandeſtine baptiſm to ſick infants who are committed to their care, as they appear in the ficti-

---

[*n*] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. par. I. p. 615.—LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 1084.

[*o*] ODOR. RAYNALD. *Annal.* tom. xv. ad A. 1318. § iv.

[*p*] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. iii. p. 1362 and 1403. CLEMENS GALANUS, *Conciliatione Eccleſiæ Armeniæ cum Romana*, tom. i. p. 527.

[*q*] *Memoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iii. p. 54.

[*r*] URB. CERRI *Etat preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 162.

tious

tious character of phyſicians [*s*]; and that, in other places, the whole ſucceſs of their miniſtry is confined to the gathering together ſome wretched tribes of indigent converts, whoſe poverty is the only bond of their attachment to the church of *Rome*, and who, when the papal largeſſes are ſuſpended or withdrawn, fall from their pretended allegiance to *Rome*, and return to the religion of their anceſtors [*t*]. It happens alſo, from time to time, that a perſon of diſtinction among the Greeks or Orientals embraces the doctrine of the Latin church, and promiſes obedience to its pontif, nay, carries matters ſo far as to repair to *Rome* to teſtify his reſpectful ſubmiſſion to the apoſtolic ſee. But in theſe obſequious ſteps the noble converts are almoſt always moved by avarice or ambition; and accordingly, when the face of their affairs changes, when they have obtained their purpoſes, and have nothing more to expect, then they, generally ſpeaking, either ſuddenly abandon the church of *Rome*, or expreſs their attachment to it in ſuch ambiguous terms, as are only calculated to deceive. Thoſe who, like the Neſtorian biſhop of *Diarbek* [*u*], continue ſtedfaſt in the profeſſion of the Roman faith, and even tranſmit it with an appearance of zeal to their poſterity, are excited to this perſeverance by no other motive than the uninterrupted liberality of the Roman pontif.

[*s*] URB. CERRI *Etat preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 164.—GABR. DE CHINON, *Relations nouvelles du Levant*, par. I. c. vi. p. 174. This Capuchin monk delivers his opinions on many ſubjects with frankneſs and candour.

[*t*] See CHARDIN'S *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. i. p. 186. tom. ii. p. 53. 75. 206. 271. 349. and principally tom. iii. p. 433. of the laſt edition publiſhed in *Holland*, in 4to; for in the former editions all the ſcandalous tranſactions of the Roman miſſionaries among the Armenians, Colchians, Iberians, and Perſians, are entirely wanting.—See alſo CHINON, *Relations du Levant*, par. II. p. 308. which regards the Armenians; and MAILLET, *Deſcription d'Egypte*, tom. iii. p. 65. which is relative to the *Copts*.

[*u*] Otherwiſe named *Amidad* and *Caramit*.

On the other hand, the biſhops of *Rome* are extremely attentive and aſſiduous in employing all the methods in their power to maintain and extend their dominion among the Chriſtians of the Eaſt. For this purpoſe, they treat, with the greateſt lenity and indulgence, the proſelytes they have made in theſe parts of the world, that their yoke may not appear intolerable. Nay, they carry this indulgence ſo far, as to ſhew evidently, that they are actuated more by a love of power, than by an attachment to their own doctrines and inſtitutions. For they do not only allow the Greek and other eaſtern proſelytes the liberty of retaining, in their public worſhip, the rites and ceremonies of their anceſtors (though in direct oppoſition with the religious ſervice of the church of *Rome*), and of living in a manner repugnant to the cuſtoms and practice of the Latin world; but, what is much more ſurpriſing, they ſuffer the peculiar doctrines, that diſtinguiſh the Greeks and Orientals from all other Chriſtian ſocieties, to remain in the public religious books of the proſelytes already mentioned, and even to be reprinted at *Rome* in thoſe that are ſent abroad for their uſe [*w*]. The truth of the matter ſeems to be briefly this: That at *Rome*, a Greek, an Armenian, or a Copt, is looked upon as an obedient child, and a worthy member of the church, if he acknowledges the ſupreme and unlimited power of the Roman pontif over all the Chriſtian world.

[*w*] ASSEMANNI complains in many paſſages of his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* that even the very books that were printed at *Rome* for the uſe of the Neſtorians, Jacobites, and Armenians, were not corrected, nor purged, from the errors peculiar to theſe ſects; and he looks upon this negligence, as the reaſon of the defection of many Roman converts, and of their return to the boſom of the eaſtern and Greek churches, to which they originally belonged.—See, on the other hand, the *Lettres Choiſies du R. Simon*, tom. ii. let. xxiii. p. 156. in which this author pretends to defend this conduct of the Romans, which ſome attribute to indolence and neglect, others to artifice and prudence.

The Maronites.

XXIV. The *Maronites*, who inhabit the mounts *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, date their ſubjection to the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the Roman pontif from the time that the Latins carried their hoſtile arms into *Paleſtine*, with a view to make themſelves maſters of the Holy land [x]. This ſubjection

---

[x] The *Maronite* doctors, and more eſpecially thoſe that reſide at *Rome*, maintain, with the greateſt efforts of zeal and argument, that the religion of *Rome* has always been preſerved among them in its purity, and exempt from any mixture of hereſy or error. The proof of this aſſertion has been attempted, with great labour and induſtry, by FAUST. NAIRON, in his *Diſſertatio de origine, nomine, ac religione, Maronitarum*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Rome*, in the year 1679. It was from this treatiſe, and ſome other Maronite writers, that DE LA ROQUE drew the materials of his diſcourſe concerning the origin of the Maronites, together with the abridgment of their hiſtory, which is inſerted in the ſecond volume of his *Voyage de Syrie et du Mont Liban*, p. 28, &c. But neither this hypotheſis, nor the authorities by which it is ſupported, have any weight with the moſt learned men of the Roman church; who maintain, that the Maronites derived their origin from the *Monophyſites*, and adhered to the doctrine of the *Monothelites* *, until the twelfth century, when they embraced the communion of *Rome*. See R. SIMON, *Hiſtoire Critique des Chrêtiens Orientaux*, ch. xiii. p. 146.—EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hiſtor. Patriarch. Alexand.* in *Præfat.* iii. 2. in *Hiſtor.* p. 49. The very learned ASSEMANNI, who was himſelf a Maronite, ſteers a middle way between theſe two oppoſite accounts, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 496. while the matter in debate is left undecided by MICH. LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 1. where he gives an account of the Maronite church and its ſpiritual rulers.—For my own part, I am perſuaded, that thoſe who conſider, that all the Maronites have not as yet embraced the faith, or acknowledged the juriſdiction, of *Rome*, will be little diſpoſed to receive with credulity the aſſertions of

* Thoſe who maintained, that, notwithſtanding the two natures in CHRIST, *viz.* the *human* and the *divine*, there was, nevertheleſs, but *one will*, which was the *divine*.

certain

jection however was agreed to, with this expreſs condition, that neither the popes nor their emiſſaries ſhould pretend to change or aboliſh any thing that related to the ancient rites, moral precepts, or religious opinions, of this people. So that, in reality, there is nothing to be found among the Maronites that ſavours of popery, if we except their attachment to the Roman pontif [*y*], who is obliged to pay very dear for their friendſhip. For, as the Maronites live in the utmoſt diſtreſs of poverty, under the tyrannical yoke of the Mahometans, the biſhop of *Rome* is under a neceſſity of furniſhing them with ſuch ſubſidies

---

certain Maronite prieſts, who are, after the manner of the Syrians, much addicted to boaſting and exaggeration. Certain it is, that there are Maronites in *Syria*, who ſtill behold the church of *Rome* with the greateſt averſion and abhorrence; nay, what is ſtill more remarkable, great numbers of that nation reſiding in *Italy*, even under the eye of the pontif, oppoſed his authority during the laſt century, and threw the court of *Rome* into great perplexity. One body of theſe non-conforming Maronites retired into the vallies of *Piedmont*, where they joined the *Waldenſes*; another, above ſix hundred in number, with a biſhop and ſeveral eccleſiaſtics at their head, fled into *Corſica*, and implored the protection of the republic of *Genoa* againſt the violence of the *Inquiſitors*. See Urb. Cerri *Etat. preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 121, 122.—Now, may it not be aſked here, What could have excited the Maronites in *Italy* to this public and vigorous oppoſition to the Roman pontif, if it be true, that their opinions were in all reſpects conformable to the doctrines and decrees of the church of *Rome?* This oppoſition could not have been owing to any thing, but a difference in point of doctrine and belief; ſince the church of *Rome* allowed, and ſtill allows, the Maronites, under its juriſdiction, to retain and perform the religious rites and inſtitutions that have been handed down to them from their anceſtors, and to follow the precepts and rules of life to which they have always been accuſtomed. Compare with the authors above-cited, *Theſaur. Epiſtol. Crozian.* tom. i. p. 11.

[*y*] The reader will do well to conſult principally, on this ſubject, the *obſervations* ſubjoined by Rich. Simon, to his French tranſlation of the Italian Jeſuit Dandini's *Voyage to Mount Libanus*, publiſhed in 12mo at *Paris*, in 1685.—See alſo Euseb. Renaudot, *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 548.

ſubſidies as may appeaſe the voracity of their oppreſſors, procure a ſubſiſtence for their biſhop and clergy, provide all things that are requiſite for the ſupport of their churches and the uninterrupted exerciſe of public worſhip, and contribute in general to leſſen their miſery. Beſides, the college erected at *Rome* by GREGORY XIII., with a deſign to inſtruct the young men, frequently ſent from *Syria*, in the various branches of uſeful ſcience and ſacred erudition, and to prepoſſeſs them with an early veneration and attachment for the Roman pontif, is attended with a very conſiderable expence. The patriarch of the Maronites performs his ſpiritual functions at *Canobin*, a convent of the monks of St. ANTHONY, on mount *Libanus*, which is his conſtant reſidence. He claims the title of *Patriarch of Antioch*, and always aſſumes the name of PETER, as if he ſeemed deſirous of being conſidered as the ſucceſſor of that apoſtle [z].

---

[z] See PETITQUEUX, *Voyage à Canobin dans le Mont Liban*, in the *Nouveaux Mémoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus*, tom. iv. p. 252. & tom. viii. p. 355.—LA ROQUE, *Voyage de Syrie*, tom. ii. p. 10.—LAUR. D'ARVIEUX, *Mémoires, ou Voyages*, tom. ii. p. 418.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

PART II.

The HISTORY of the MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAP. I.

The HISTORY *of the* LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The commencement of the Lutheran church.

I. THE riſe and progreſs of the *Evangelical*, or *Lutheran*, church, have been already related, ſo far as they belong to the hiſtory of the Reformation. The former of theſe titles was aſſumed by that church in conſequence of the original deſign of its founders, which was to reſtore to its native luſtre the *Goſpel* of CHRIST, that had ſo long been covered with the darkneſs of ſuperſtition, or, in other words, to place in its proper and true light that important doctrine, which repreſents ſalvation as attainable by the merits of CHRIST alone. Nor did the church, now under conſideration, diſcover any reluctance againſt adopting the name of the great man, whom Providence employed as the honoured inſtrument of its foundation and eſtabliſhment. A natural ſentiment of gratitude to him, by whoſe miniſtry the clouds of ſuperſtition had been chiefly diſpelled, who had deſtroyed the claims of pride and ſelf-ſufficiency, expoſed the vanity of confidence in the interceſſion of ſaints and martyrs, and pointed out the Son of God as the only proper object of truſt to miſerable mortals, excited his followers to aſſume his name, and to call their community the *Lutheran* Church.

The riſe of this church muſt be dated from that remarkable period, when the pontif LEO X. drove MARTIN LUTHER, with his friends and followers, from the boſom of the Roman hierarchy, by a ſolemn and violent ſentence of excommunication. It began to acquire a regular form, and a conſiderable degree of ſtability and conſiſtence, from the year 1530, when the ſyſtem of doctrine and morality it had adopted, was drawn up and preſented to the diet of *Augſburg*. And it was raiſed to the dignity of a lawful and complete hierarchy, totally independent on the laws and juriſdiction of the Roman pontif, in conſequence of the treaty concluded at *Paſſau*, in the year 1552, between CHARLES V. and MAURICE elector of *Saxony*, relating to the religious affairs of the empire.

The form and ſubſtance of its religious doctrine.

II. The great and leading principle of the Lutheran church, is, that the Holy Scriptures are the only ſource from whence we are to draw our religious ſentiments, whether they relate to faith or practice; and that theſe inſpired writings are, in all matters that are eſſential to ſalvation, ſo plain, and ſo eaſy to be thoroughly underſtood, that their ſignification may be learned, without the aid of an expoſitor, by every perſon of common ſenſe, who has a competent knowledge of the language in which they are compoſed. There are, indeed, certain *formularies* adopted by this church, which contain the principal points of its doctrine, ranged, for the ſake of method and perſpicuity, in their natural order. But theſe books have no authority but what they derive from the ſcriptures of truth, whoſe ſenſe and meaning they are deſigned to convey; nor are the Lutheran doctors permitted to interpret or explain theſe books ſo as to draw from them any propoſitions that are inconſiſtent with the expreſs declarations of the word of God. The chief and the moſt reſpectable of theſe human productions is the *Confeſſion of Augſburg*, with the annexed *Defence* of it againſt the objections of the Roman-catholic doctors [a]. In the next rank may be placed the *Articles*

☞ [a] When the confeſſion of *Augſburg* had been preſented to the diet of that city, the Roman-catholic doctors were employed to refute the doctrines it contained; and this pretended refutation was alſo read to that auguſt aſſembly. A reply was immediately drawn up by MELANCTHON, and preſented to the emperor; who, under the pretext of a pacific ſpirit, refuſed to receive it. This reply was publiſhed afterwards, under the title of *Apologia Confeſſionis Auguſtanæ*; and is the defence of that confeſſion, mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM as annexed to it. To ſpeak plain, MELANCTHON's love of peace and concord ſeems to have carried him beyond what he owed to the truth, in compoſing this *Defence* of the confeſſion of *Augſburg*. In the edition of that defence that ſome Lutherans (and CHYTRÆUS among others) look upon as the moſt genuine and authentic, MELANCTHON makes ſeveral ſtrange conceſſions to the church of *Rome*; whether through ſervile fear, exceſſive charity, or heſitation of mind, I will not pretend to determine. He ſpeaks of the preſence of CHRIST's body in the euchariſt in the very ſtrongeſt terms that the Roman-catholics uſe to expreſs the monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and adopts thoſe remarkable words of THEOPHYLACT, that *the bread was not a figure only, but was* TRULY *changed into fleſh*. He approves of that canon of the maſs, in which the prieſt prays that *the bread may be changed into the body of Chriſt*. It is true that in ſome ſubſequent editions of the *defence* or *apology* now under conſideration, theſe obnoxious paſſages were left out, and the phraſeology, that had given ſuch juſt offence, was conſiderably mitigated. There is an ample account of this whole matter, together with a hiſtory of the diſſenſions of the Lutheran church, in the valuable and learned work of HOSPINIAN, entitled *Hiſtoriæ Sacramentariæ Pars poſterior*, p. 199, & ſeq.—Theſe expreſſions, in MELANCTHON's *Apologia*, will appear ſtill more ſurpriſing, when we recollect that, in the courſe of the debates concerning the manner of Chriſt's preſence in the euchariſt, he, at length, ſeemed to lean viſibly towards the opinions of BUCER and CALVIN; and that, after his death, his followers were cenſured and perſecuted in *Saxony* on this account, under the denomination

Articles of Smalcald [b], as they are commonly called, together with the ſhorter and larger *Catechiſms of* LUTHER, deſigned for the inſtruction of youth, and the improvement of perſons of riper years. To theſe ſtandard-books moſt churches add the *Form of Concord*; which, though it be not univerſally received, has not, on that account, occaſioned any animoſity or diſunion; as the few points that prevent its being adopted by ſome churches are of an indifferent nature [c], and do

not,

---

denomination of *Philippiſts*. This ſhews either, that the great man now under conſideration changed his opinions, or that he had formerly been ſeeking union and concord at the expence of truth.

☞ [b] The *Articles*, here mentioned, were drawn up at *Smalcald* by LUTHER, on occaſion of a meeting of the proteſtant electors, princes, and ſtates, at that place. They were principally deſigned to ſhew how far the *Lutherans* were diſpoſed to go in order to avoid a final rupture, and in what ſenſe they were willing to adopt the doctrine of Chriſt's preſence in the euchariſt. And though the terms in which theſe *articles* are expreſſed be ſomewhat dubious, yet they are much leſs harſh and diſguſting than thoſe uſed in the *Confeſſion*, the *Apology*, and the *Form of Concord*.

☞ [c] Dr. MOSHEIM, like an artful painter, ſhades thoſe objects in the hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, which it is impoſſible to expoſe with advantage to a full view. Of this nature was the conduct of the Lutheran doctors in the deliberations relating to the famous *Form of Concord* here mentioned; a conduct that diſcovered ſuch an imperious and uncharitable ſpirit, as would have been more conſiſtent with the genius of the court of *Rome* than with the principles of a proteſtant church. The reader, who is deſirous of an ample demonſtration of the truth and juſtice of this cenſure, has only to conſult the learned work of ROD. HOSPINIAN, entitled, *Concordia Diſcors, ſeu de Origine et Progreſſu Formulæ Concordiæ Burgenſis.* The hiſtory of this remarkable production is more amply related in the thirty-ninth and following paragraphs of this firſt chapter, and in the notes, which the tranſlator has taken the liberty to add there, in order to caſt a proper light upon ſome things that are too intereſting to be viewed ſuperficially. In the mean time I ſhall only obſerve, that the points in the *Form of Concord*, that prevented its being univerſally received, are not of ſuch an indifferent nature as Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems

to

not, in any degree, affect the grand and fundamental principles of true religion [*d*].

The ceremonies and public worſhip of the Lutheran church.

III. The form of public worſhip, and the rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted as a part of it, gave riſe to diſputes in ſeveral places, during the infancy of the Lutheran church. Some were inclined to retain a greater number of the ceremonies and cuſtoms that had been ſo exceſſively multiplied in the church of *Rome*, than ſeemed either lawful or expedient to others. The latter, after the example of the Helvetic reformers, had their views entirely turned towards that ſimplicity and gravity that characteriſed the Chriſtian worſhip in the primitive times; while the former were of opinion, that ſome indulgence was to be ſhewn to the weakneſs of the multitude, and ſome regard paid to inſtitutions that had acquired a certain degree of weight through long eſtabliſhed cuſtom. But as theſe contending parties were both perſuaded that the ceremonial part of religion was, generally ſpeaking, a matter of human inſtitution, and that conſequently a diverſity of external rites might be admitted among different churches profeſſing the ſame religion, without any prejudice to the bonds of charity and fraternal union, theſe diſputes could not be of any long duration. In the mean time, all thoſe ceremonies and obſervances of the church of *Rome*,

---

to imagine. To maintain the *ubiquity*, or omnipreſence, of CHRIST's body, together with its *real* and peculiar preſence, in the euchariſt, and to exclude from their communion the proteſtants, who denied theſe palpable abſurdities, was the plan of the Lutheran doctors in compoſing and recommending the *Form of Concord*; and this plan can neither be looked upon as a matter of pure indifference, nor as a mark of Chriſtian charity. But for a farther proof of this, ſee § xxxix. already referred to.

[*d*] See, for an account of the Lutheran confeſſions of faith, CHRIST. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 114.

Rome, whether of a public or private nature, that carried palpable marks of error and ſuperſtition, were every where rejected without heſitation; and wiſe precautions were uſed to regulate the forms of public worſhip in ſuch a manner, that the genuine fruits of piety ſhould not be choked by a multitude of inſignificant rites. Beſides, every church was allowed the privilege of retaining ſo much of the ancient form of worſhip as might be ſtill obſerved without giving offence, and as ſeemed ſuited to the character of the people, the genius of the government, and the nature and circumſtances of the place where it was founded. Hence it has happened, that, even ſo far down as the preſent times, the Lutheran churches differ conſiderably one from the other, with reſpect both to the number and nature of their religious ceremonies; a circumſtance ſo far from tending to their diſhonour, that it is, on the contrary, a very ſtriking proof of their wiſdom and moderation [*e*].

Concerning the viſible head, and the form of government of the Lutheran church.

IV. The ſupreme civil rulers of every Lutheran ſtate are clothed alſo with the dignity, and perform the functions of ſupremacy in the church. The very eſſence of civil government ſeems manifeſtly to point out the neceſſity of inveſting the ſovereign with this ſpiritual ſupremacy [*f*], and the tacit conſent of the Luthern churches has confirmed the dictates of wiſe policy in this reſpect. It muſt not, however, be imagined, that the ancient rights and privileges of the people in eccleſiaſtical affairs have been totally aboliſhed by this conſtitution of things; ſince it is certain, that the veſtiges of the authority exerciſed by them in the primitive times, though more ſtriking in one place than in another, are yet more or leſs viſible every where. Beſides, it muſt be carefully remembered, that all civil rulers of the Lutheran perſuaſion are effectually reſtrained, by the fundamental principles of the doctrine they profeſs, from any attempts to change or deſtroy the eſtabliſhed rule of faith and manners, to make any alteration in the eſſential doctrines of their religion, or in any thing that is intimately connected with them, or to impoſe their particular opinions upon their ſubjects in a deſpotic and arbitrary manner.

[*e*] See BALTH. MEISNERUS, *Lib. de Legibus*, lib. iv. art. iv. quæſt. iv. p. 662—666.—JO. ADAM SCHERZERUS, *Breviar. Hulſemann. Enucl.* p. 1313—1321.

☞ [*f*] Since nothing is more inconſiſtent with that ſubordination and concord, which are among the great ends of civil government, than *imperium in imperio*, i. e. two *independent ſovereignties* in the ſame *body politic*: Hence the genius of government, as well as the ſpirit of genuine Chriſtianity, proclaims the equity of that conſtitution, that makes the ſupreme head of the ſtate, the ſupreme viſible ruler of the church.

The councils, or ſocieties, appointed by the ſovereign to watch over the intereſts of the church, and to govern and direct its affairs, are compoſed of perſons verſed in the knowledge both of civil and eccleſiaſtical law, and, according to a very ancient denomination, are called *Conſiſtories*. The internal government of the Lutheran church ſeems equally removed from *epiſcopacy* on the one hand, and from *preſbyterianiſm* on the other, if we except the kingdoms of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, who retain the form of eccleſiaſtical government that preceded the reformation, purged, indeed, from the ſuperſtitions and abuſes that rendered it ſo odious [g]. This conſtitution of the Lutheran hierarchy will not ſeem ſurpriſing, when the ſentiments

---

☞ [g] In theſe two kingdoms the church is ruled by *biſhops* and *ſuperintendants*, under the inſpection and authority of the ſovereign. The Archbiſhop of *Upſal* is primate of *Sweden*, and the only archbiſhop among the Lutherans. The luxury and licentiouſneſs, that too commonly flow from the opulence of the Roman-catholic clergy, are unknown in theſe two northern ſtates; ſince the revenues of the prelate now mentioned do not amount to more than 400 pounds yearly, while thoſe of the biſhops are proportionably ſmall.

timents of that people, with reſpect to eccleſiaſtical polity, are duly conſidered. On the one hand, they are perſuaded that there is no law, of divine authority, which points out a diſtinction between the miniſters of the goſpel, with reſpect to rank, dignity, or prerogatives; and therefore they recede from *epiſcopacy*. But, on the other hand, they are of opinion, that a certain ſubordination, a diverſity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, are not only highly uſeful, but alſo neceſſary to the perfection of church communion, by connecting, in conſequence of a mutual dependence, more cloſely together the members of the ſame body; and thus they avoid the uniformity of the *preſbyterian* government. They are not, however, agreed with reſpect to the extent of this ſubordination, and the degrees of ſuperiority and precedence that ought to diſtinguiſh their doctors; for in ſome places this is regulated with much more regard to the ancient rules of church-government, than is diſcovered in others. As the divine law is ſilent on this head, different opinions may be entertained, and different forms of eccleſiaſtical polity adopted, without a breach of Chriſtian charity and fraternal union.

The Lutheran liturgies, their public worſhip, and their method of inſtructing.

V. Every country has its own *Liturgies*, which are the rules of proceeding in every thing that relates to external worſhip and the public exerciſe of religion. Theſe rules, however, are not of an immutable nature, like thoſe inſtitutions which bear the ſtamp of a divine authority, but may be augmented, corrected, or illuſtrated, by the order of the ſovereign, when ſuch changes appear evidently to be neceſſary or expedient. The liturgies uſed in the different countries that have embraced the ſyſtem of LUTHER, agree perfectly in all the eſſential branches of religion, in all matters that can be looked upon as of real moment and importance; but they differ widely in many things of an indifferent nature, concerning which the Holy Scriptures are ſilent, and which compoſe that part of the public religion that derives its authority from the wiſdom and appointment of men. Aſſemblies for the celebration of divine worſhip meet every where at ſtated times. Here the Holy Scriptures are read publicly, prayers and hymns are addreſſed to the Deity, the ſacraments are adminiſtered, and the people are inſtructed in the knowledge of religion, and excited to the practice of virtue by the diſcourſes of their miniſters. The wiſeſt methods are uſed for the religious education of youth, who are not only carefully inſtructed in the elements of Chriſtianity in the public ſchools, but are alſo examined, by the paſtors of the churches to which they belong, in a public manner, in order to the farther improvement of their knowledge, and the more vigorous exertion of their faculties in the ſtudy of divine truth. Hence, in almoſt every province, *Catechiſms*, which contain the eſſential truths of religion and the main precepts of morality, are publiſhed and recommended by the authority of the ſovereign, as rules to be followed by the maſters of ſchools, and by the miniſters of the church, both in their private and public inſtructions. But as LUTHER left behind him an accurate and judicious production of this kind, in which the fundamental principles of religion and morality are explained and confirmed with the greateſt perſpicuity and force both of evidence and expreſſion, this compendious *Catechiſm* of that eminent reformer is univerſally adopted as the firſt introduction to religious knowledge, and is one of the *ſtandard-books* of the church which bears his name. And, indeed, all the provincial catechiſms are no more than illuſtrations and enlargements on this excellent abridgment of faith and practice.

VI. Among

The holidays, and eccleſiaſtical diſcipline of the Lutheran church.

VI. Among the days that are held ſacred in the Lutheran church (beſides that which is celebrated, every week, in memory of CHRIST's reſurrection from the dead), we may reckon all ſuch as were ſignalized by thoſe glorious and important events that proclaim the celeſtial miſſion of the Saviour, and the divine authority of his holy religion [*b*]. Theſe ſacred feſtivals, the grateful and well-grounded piety of ancient times had always held in the higheſt veneration. But the Lutheran church has gone yet farther; and, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, has retained ſeveral which ſeem to have derived the reſpect that is paid to them, rather from the ſuggeſtions of ſuperſtition than from the dictates of true religion. There are ſome churches, who carry the deſire of multiplying feſtivals ſo far, as to obſerve religiouſly the days that were formerly ſet apart for celebrating the memory of the *Twelve Apoſtles.*

It is well known that the power of *excommunication*, i. e. of baniſhing from its boſom obſtinate and ſcandalous tranſgreſſors, was a privilege enjoyed and exerciſed by the church from the remoteſt antiquity; and it is no leſs certain, that this privilege was perverted often to the moſt iniquitous and odious purpoſes. The founders, therefore, of the Lutheran church undertook to remove the abuſes and corruptions under which this branch of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline laboured, and to reſtore it to its primitive purity and vigour. At firſt their attempt ſeemed to be crowned with ſucceſs; ſince it is plain, that, during the ſixteenth century, no oppoſition of any moment was made to the wiſe and moderate exerciſe of this ſpiritual authority. But in proceſs of time this privilege fell imperceptibly into contempt; the terror of excommunication

---

☞ [*b*] Such (for example) are the *nativity, death, reſurrection* and *aſcenſion* of the Son of God; the deſcent of the holy Spirit upon the apoſtles on the day of Pentecoſt, &c.

nication loſt its force; and eccleſiaſtical diſcipline was reduced to ſuch a ſhadow, that, in moſt places, there are ſcarcely any remains, any traces of it to be ſeen at this day. This change may be attributed partly to the corrupt propenſities of mankind, who are naturally deſirous of deſtroying the influence of every inſtitution that is deſigned to curb their licentious paſſions. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that this relaxation of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline was not owing to this cauſe alone; other circumſtances concurred to diminiſh the reſpect and ſubmiſſion that had been paid to the ſpiritual tribunal. On the one hand, the clergy abuſed this important privilege in various ways; ſome miſapplying the ſeverity of excommunication through ignorance or imprudence, while others, ſtill more impiouſly, perverted an inſtitution, in itſelf extremely uſeful, to ſatisfy their private reſentments, and to avenge themſelves of thoſe who had dared to offend them. On the other hand, the counſels of certain perſons in power, who conſidered the privilege of excommunicating in the hands of the clergy, as derogatory from the majeſty of the ſovereign, and detrimental to the intereſts of civil ſociety, had no ſmall influence in bringing this branch of ghoſtly juriſdiction into diſrepute. It is however certain, that whatever cauſes may have contributed to produce this effect, the effect itſelf was much to be lamented; as it removed one of the moſt powerful reſtraints upon iniquity. Nor will it appear ſurpriſing, when this is duly conſidered, that the manners of the Lutherans are ſo remarkably depraved, and that in a church that is deprived almoſt of all authority and diſcipline, multitudes affront the public by their audacious irregularities, and tranſgreſs, with a frontleſs impudence, through the proſpect of impunity.

Of the proſperous and calamitous events that have happened to the Lutheran church.

VII. The proſperous and unfavourable events that belong to the hiſtory of the Lutheran church, ſince the happy eſtabliſhment of its liberty and independence, are neither numerous nor remarkable, and may conſequently be mentioned in a few words. The riſe and progreſs of this church, before its final and permanent eſtabliſhment, have been already related; but that very religious peace, which was the inſtrument of its ſtability and independence, ſet bounds, at the ſame time, to its progreſs in the empire, and prevented it effectually from extending its limits [i]. Towards the concluſion of this century, GEBHARD, archbiſhop of *Cologn*, diſcovered a propenſity to enter into its communion, and, having contracted the bonds of matrimony, formed the deſign of introducing the reformation into his dominions. But this arduous attempt, which was in direct contradiction with the famous *Eccleſiaſtical Reſervation* [k] ſtipulated in the articles of the peace of religion concluded at *Augſburg*, proved abortive, and the prelate was obliged to reſign his dignity, and to abandon his country [l]. On the other hand, it is certain, that the adverſaries of the Lutheran church were not permitted to diſturb its

---

☞ [i] The reaſon of this will be ſeen in the following note.

☞ [k] In the diet of *Augſburg*, which was aſſembled in the year 1555, in order to execute the treaty of *Paſſau*, the ſeveral ſtates, that had already embraced the Lutheran religion, were confirmed in the full enjoyment of their religious liberty. To prevent, however, as far as was poſſible, the farther progreſs of the reformation, CHARLES V. ſtipulated for the catholics the famous *Eccleſiaſtical Reſervation*; by which it was decreed, that if any archbiſhop, prelate, biſhop, or other eccleſiaſtic, ſhould, in time to come, renounce the faith of *Rome*, his dignity and benefice ſhould be forfeited, and his place be filled by the chapter or college, poſſeſſed of the power of election.

[l] See JO. DAV. KOLERI *Diſſertatio de Gebhardo Truchſeſſio.*—JO. PET. à LUDEWIG *Reliquiæ MStorum omnis ævi*, tom. v. p. 383.—See alſo a German work, entitled, *Unſchuldige Nachricten.* A. 1748, p. 484.

tranquillity, or to hurt, in any eſſential point, its liberty, proſperity, and independence. Their intentions, indeed, were malignant enough; and it appeared evident, from many ſtriking circumſtances, that they were ſecretly projecting a new attack upon the proteſtants, with a view to annul the treaty of *Paſſau*, which had been confirmed at *Augſburg*, and to have them declared public enemies to the empire. Such was undoubtedly the unjuſt and ſeditious deſign of FRANCIS BURCKHARD, in compoſing the famous book *De Autonomia*, which was publiſhed in the year 1586; and alſo of PISTORIUS, in drawing up the *Reaſons*, which the marquis of BADE alleged in vindication of his returning back from Lutheraniſm into the boſom of popery [m]. Theſe writers, and others of the ſame ſtamp, treat the *Religious Peace*, negociated at *Paſſau*, and ratified at *Augſburg*, as unjuſt, becauſe obtained by force of arms, and as null, becauſe concluded without the knowledge and conſent of the Roman pontif. They pretend alſo to prove, that by the changes and interpolations, which they affirm to have been made by MELANCTHON, in the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, after it had been preſented to the diet, the proteſtants forfeited all the privileges and advantages that they derived from the treaty now mentioned. This latter accuſation gave riſe to long and warm debates during this and the following century. Many learned and ingenious productions were publiſhed on that occaſion, in which the Lutheran divines proved, with the utmoſt perſpicuity and force of argument, that the Confeſſion of *Augſburg* was preſerved in their church in its firſt ſtate, uncorrupted by any mixture, and that none of their brethren had ever departed in any inſtance from the doctrines it contains [n]. They that felt moſt ſenſibly the bitter and implacable hatred of the papiſts againſt the doctrine and worſhip of the Lutheran church (which they diſdainfully called the *new religion*), were the members of that church who lived in the territories of Roman-catholic princes. This is more eſpecially true of the proteſtant ſubjects of the houſe of *Auſtria* [o], who have experienced, in the moſt affecting manner, the dire effects of bigotry and ſuperſtition ſeated on a throne, and who loſt the greateſt part of their liberty before the concluſion of this century.

---

[m] See CHR. AUG. SALIG, *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſion.* tom. i. lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 767.

The ſtate of learning among the Lutherans.

VIII. While the votaries of *Rome* were thus meditating the ruin of the Lutheran church, and exerting, for this purpoſe, all the powers of ſecret artifice and open violence, the followers of LUTHER were aſſiduouſly bent on defeating their efforts, and left no means unemployed, that ſeemed proper to maintain their own doctrine, and to ſtrengthen their cauſe. The calamities they had ſuffered were freſh in their remembrance; and hence they were admoniſhed to uſe all poſſible precautions to prevent their falling again into the like unhappy circumſtances. Add to this, the zeal of princes and men in power for the advancement of true religion, which, it muſt be acknowledged, was much greater in this century, than it is in the times in which we live. Hence the original confederacy that had been formed among the German princes for the maintenance of Lutheraniſm, and of which the elector of *Saxony* was the chief, gained new ſtrength from day to day, and foreign ſovereigns, particularly thoſe of *Sweden* and *Denmark*, were invited to enter into this grand alliance. And as it was univerſally agreed, that the ſtability and luſtre of the riſing church depended much on the learning of its miniſters, and the progreſs of the ſciences among thoſe in general who profeſſed its doctrines, ſo the greateſt part of the confederate princes promoted, with the greateſt zeal, the culture of letters, and baniſhed, wherever their ſalutary influence could extend, that baneful ignorance that is the mother of ſuperſtition. The academies founded by the Lutherans at *Jena*, *Helmſtadt*, and *Altorf*, and by the Calviniſts at *Franeker*, *Leyden*, and other places; the ancient univerſities reformed and accommodated to the conſtitution and exigences of a purer church than that under whoſe influence they had been at firſt eſtabliſhed; the great number of ſchools that were opened in every city; the ample rewards, together with the diſtinguiſhed honours and privileges, that were beſtowed on men of learning and genius; all theſe circumſtances bear honourable teſtimony to the generous zeal of the German princes for the advancement of uſeful knowledge. Theſe noble eſtabliſhments were undoubtedly expenſive, and required large funds for their ſupport. Theſe were principally drawn from the revenues and poſſeſſions, which the piety or ſuperſtition of ancient times had conſecrated to the multiplication of convents, the erection or embelliſhment of churches, and other religious uſes.

---

[n] See SALIG, *Hiſt. Auguſt. Confeſſionis*, tom. i.—It cannot indeed be denied, that MELANCTHON corrected and altered ſome paſſages of the Confeſſion of *Augſburg*. Nay, more; it is certain, that, in the year 1555, he made uſe of the extraordinary credit and influence he then had, to introduce among the Saxon churches an edition of that Confeſſion, which was not only corrected in ſeveral places, but was, moreover, upon the whole, very different from the original one. But his conduct in this ſtep, which was extremely audacious, or at leaſt highly imprudent, never received the approbation of the Lutheran church, nor was the *Augſburg* Confeſſion, in this new ſhape, ever admitted as one of the ſtandard-books of its faith and doctrine.

[o] See the *Auſtri Evangelica* of the learned RAUPACHIUS, tom. i. p. 152. tom. ii. p. 287. This work is compoſed in the German language.

The ſtudy of Belles Lettres and languages promoted.

IX. Theſe generous and zealous efforts in the cauſe of learning were attended with remarkable ſucceſs. Almoſt all the liberal arts and ſciences were cultivated with emulation, and brought to greater degrees of perfection. All thoſe, whoſe views were turned to the ſervice of the church, were obliged to apply themſelves, with diligence and aſſiduity, to the ſtudy of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin literature, in order to qualify them for forming, with dignity and ſucceſs, the duties of the ſacred function; and it is well known, that in theſe branches of erudition ſeveral Lutheran doctors excelled in ſuch a manner, as to acquire a deathleſs name in the republic of letters. MELANCTHON, CARIO, CHYTRÆUS, REINECCIUS, and others, were eminent for their knowledge of hiſtory. More particularly FLACIUS, one of the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes* * (that immortal work, which reſtored to the light of evidence and truth the facts relating to the riſe and progreſs of the Chriſtian church, which had been covered with thick darkneſs, and corrupted by innumerable fables), may be deſervedly conſidered as the parent of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Nor ſhould we omit mentioning the learned MARTIN CHEMNITZ, to whoſe *Examination of the Decrees of the Council of Trent*, the hiſtory of religion is more indebted, than many, at this day, are apt to imagine. While ſo many branches of learning were cultivated with zeal, ſome, it muſt be confeſſed, were

---

☞ * The joint authors of this famous work (beſides FLACIUS ILLYRICUS) were NICOLAUS GALLUS, JOHANNES WIGANDUS, and MATTHIAS JUDEX, all miniſters of *Magdeburg*; and they were aſſiſted by CASPAR NIDPRUCKIUS an Imperial counſellor, JOHANNES BAPTISTA HEINCELIUS an Auguſtinian, BASIL FABER, and others.

too little purſued. Among theſe we may place the hiſtory of literature and philoſophy; the important ſcience of criticiſm; the ſtudy of antiquities; and other objects of erudition that ſtand in connexion with them. It is, however, to be obſerved, that notwithſtanding the neglect with which theſe branches of ſcience ſeemed, too generally, to have been treated, the foundations of their culture and improvement in future ages were really laid in this century. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Latin eloquence and poetry were carried to a very high degree of improvement, and exhibited orators and poets of the firſt order; from which circumſtance alone it may be fairly concluded, that, if all the branches of literature and philoſophy were not brought to that pitch of perfection of which they were ſuſceptible, this was not owing to the want of induſtry or genius, but rather to the reſtraints laid upon genius by the infelicity of the times. All the votaries of ſcience, whom a noble emulation excited to the purſuit of literary fame, were greatly animated by the example, the influence, and the inſtructions of MELANCTHON, who was deſervedly conſidered as the great and leading doctor of the Lutheran church, and whoſe ſentiments, relating both to ſacred and profane erudition, were ſo univerſally reſpected, that ſcarcely any had the courage to oppoſe them. In the next rank to this eminent reformer may be mentioned JOACHIM CAMERARIUS of *Leipſic*, a ſhining ornament to the republic of letters in this century, who, by his zeal and application contributed much to promote the cauſe of univerſal learning, and more eſpecially the ſtudy of elegant literature.

The various fate of philoſophy among the Lutherans.

X. The revolutions of philoſophy among the Lutheran doctors were many and various. LUTHER and MELANCTHON ſeemed to ſet out with a reſolution to baniſh every ſpecies of philoſophy [p] from the church; and though it is impoſſible to juſtify entirely this part of their conduct, yet they are leſs to be blamed than thoſe ſcholaſtic doctors, whoſe barbarous method of teaching philoſophy was inexpreſſively diſguſting, and who, by a miſerable abuſe of the ſubtile precepts of ARISTOTLE, had perverted the dictates of common ſenſe, and introduced the greateſt obſcurity and confuſion both in philoſophy and religion. But though theſe abuſes led the two great men now mentioned too far, and were carrying them into the oppoſite extreme; yet their own recollection ſuſpended their precipitation, and they both perceived, before it was too late, that true philoſophy was neceſſary to reſtrain the licentious, flights of mere genius and fancy, and to guard the ſanctuary of religion againſt the inroads of ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm [q]. It was in conſequence of this perſuaſion that MELANCTHON compoſed, in a plain and familiar ſtyle, abridgments of almoſt all the various branches of philoſophy, which, during many years, were explained publicly to the ſtudious youth in all the Lutheran academies and ſchools of learning. This celebrated reformer may not improperly be conſidered as an *eclectic*; for though in many points he followed ARISTOTLE, and retained ſome degree of propenſity to the ancient philoſophy of the ſchools, yet he drew many things from the fecundity of his own genius, and had often recourſe alſo to the doctrines of the Platonics and Stoics.

---

[p] See CHRIST. AUG. HEUMANNI *Acta philoſophor.* art. ii. part X. p. 579.—JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *Diſſertat. de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna in Scholis Proteſtantium*, which LAUNOY has prefixed to his book *De fortuna Ariſtotelis in Academia Pariſienſi*, § viii. p. 15. § xiii. p. 36.

☞ [q] Some writers, either through malignity or for want of better information, have pretended that LUTHER rejected the ſcholaſtic philoſophy through a total ignorance of its nature and precepts. Thoſe that have ventured upon ſuch an aſſertion muſt have been themſelves groſsly ignorant of the Hiſtory of Literature in general, as well as of the induſtry and erudition of LUTHER in particular. For a demonſtrative proof of this, ſee BRUCKERI *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iv. part I. p. 94, 95, 96, &c.

Philoſophical ſect—Ariſtotelians and Ramæans.

XI. This method of teaching philoſophy, however recommendable on account of its ſimplicity and perſpicuity, did not long enjoy alone and unrivalled, the great credit and authority it had obtained. Certain acute and ſubtile doctors, having perceived that Melancthon, in compoſing his *Abridgments*, had diſcovered a peculiar and predominant attachment to the philoſophy of Aristotle, thought it was better to go to the ſource, than to drink at the ſtream; and therefore read and explained to their diſciples the works of the Stagirite. On the other hand, it was obſerved, that the Jeſuits, and other votaries of *Rome*, artfully made uſe of the ambiguous terms and the intricate ſophiſtry of the ancient ſchoolmen, in order to puzzle the proteſtants, and to reduce them to ſilence, when they wanted ſuch arguments as were adapted to produce conviction. And, therefore, many proteſtant doctors thought it might be advantageous to their cauſe to have the ſtudious youth inſtructed in the myſteries of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, as it was taught in the ſchools, that thus they might be qualified to defend themſelves with the ſame weapons with which they were attacked. Hence there aroſe, towards the concluſion of this century, three philoſophical ſects, the *Melancthonian*, the *Ariſtotelian*, and the *Scholaſtic*. The firſt declined gradually, and ſoon diſappeared; while the other two imperceptibly grew into one, and acquired new vigour by this coalition, increaſed daily in reputation and influence, and were adopted in all the ſchools of learning. It is true, the followers of Ramus made violent inroads, in ſeveral places, upon the territories of theſe combined ſects, and ſometimes with a certain appearance of ſucceſs; but their hopes were tranſitory; for after various ſtruggles they were obliged to yield, and were, at length, entirely baniſhed from the ſchools [r].

The Paracelſiſts, or Fire philoſophers.

XII. Such alſo was the fate of the diſciples of PARACELSUS, who, from the grand principle of their phyſical ſyſtem, were called *Fire-philoſophers* [s], and who aimed at nothing leſs than the total ſubverſion of the peripatetic philoſophy and the introduction of their own reveries into the public ſchools. Towards the concluſion of this century the Paracelſiſts really made a figure in almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, as their ſect was patronized and ſupported by the genius and eloquence of ſeveral great men, who exerted themſelves, with the utmoſt zeal and aſſiduity, in its cauſe, and endeavoured, both by their writings and their tranſactions, to augment its credit. In *England* it found an eminent defender in M. ROBERT FLOOD, or FLUDD, a man of a very ſingular genius [t], who illuſtrated, or at leaſt attempted

---

[r] JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *De fatis Ariſtot. in Scholis Proteſt.* § xxi. p. 54.—JO. GEORG. WALCHIUS, *Hiſtoria Logices*, lib. ii. cap. i. § iii. v. *in Parergis Academicis*, p. 613. 617.—OTTO FRID. SCHUTZIUS, *De vita Chytræi*, lib. iv. § iv. p. 19.

☞ [s] This fanatical ſect of philoſophers had ſeveral denominations. They were called *Theoſophiſts*, from their declaiming againſt *human reaſon* as a dangerous and deceitful guide, and their repreſenting a *divine and ſupernatural illumination* as the only means of arriving at truth. They were called *Philoſophi per ignem*, i. e. *Fire-philoſophers*, from their maintaining that the intimate eſſences of natural things were only to be known by the trying efforts of *fire*, directed in a chymical proceſs. They were, laſtly, denominated *Paracelſiſts*, from the eminent phyſician and chymiſt of that name, who was the chief ornament and leader of that extraordinary ſect.

☞ [t] The perſon here mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM is not the famous Dominican monk of that name, who, from his ardent purſuit of mathematical knowledge, was called the *Seeker*, and who, from his paſſion for chymiſtry, was ſuſpected of attempted to illuſtrate, the philoſophy of PARACELSUS, in a great number of treatiſes, which, even in our times, are not entirely deſtitute of readers and admirers. The ſame philoſophy got a certain footing in *France*, had ſeveral votaries in that kingdom, and was propagated with zeal at *Paris*, by a perſon whoſe name was RIVIER, in oppoſition to the ſentiments and efforts of the univerſity of that city [*u*]. Its cauſe was induſtriouſly promoted in *Denmark* by SEVERINUS [*w*]; in *Germany* by KUNRATH, an eminent phyſician at *Dreſden*, who died in the year 1605 [*x*]; and in other countries by a conſiderable number of warm votaries, who were by no means unſucceſsful in augmenting its reputation, and multiplying its followers. As all theſe heralds of the new philoſophy accompanied their inſtructions with a ſtriking air of piety and devotion, and ſeemed, in propagating their ſtrange *ſyſtem*, to propoſe to themſelves no other end than the advancement of the divine glory, and the reſtoration of peace and concord in a divided church; a motive, in appearance, ſo generous and noble could not fail to procure them friends and protectors. Accordingly we find that, towards the concluſion of this century, ſeveral perſons, eminent for their piety and diſtinguiſhed by their zeal for the advancement of true religion, joined themſelves to this ſect. Of this number were the Lutheran doctors WIGELIUS, ARNDIUS, and others,

---

of magic, but a famous phyſician born in the year 1574, at *Milgate* in *Kent*, and very remarkable for his attachment to the alchymiſts. See ANT. WOOD, *Athenar. Oxonienſ.* vol. i. p. 610. & *Hiſt. et Antiq. Acad. Oxonienſ.* lib. ii. p. 390.—P. GASSENDI *Examen Philoſoph. Fluddanæ*, tom. iii. opp. p. 259.

[*u*] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. vi. p. 327, & paſſim.

[*w*] JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 623.

[*x*] JO. MOLLERI, *ibid.* tom. ii. p. 440.

who were led into the ſnare by their ill-grounded notions of human reaſon, and who apprehended that controverſy and argumentation might lead men to ſubſtitute anew the pompous and intricate jargon of the ſchools in the place of ſolid and ſincere piety.

The controverſy between Hofmann and his colleagues.

XIII. Among thoſe that diſcovered a propenſity towards the ſyſtem of the Paracelſiſts, or Theoſophiſts, was the celebrated DANIEL HOFMANN, Profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of *Helmſtadt*, who, from the year 1598, had declared open war againſt philoſophy, and who continued to oppoſe it with the greateſt obſtinacy and violence. Laying hold of ſome particular opinions of LUTHER, and certain paſſages in the writings of that great man, he extravagantly maintained that philoſophy was the mortal enemy of religion; that *truth* was diviſible into two branches, the one *philoſophical* and the other *theological*; and that what was *true* in philoſophy, was *falſe* in theology. Theſe abſurd and pernicious tenets naturally alarmed the judicious doctors of the univerſity, and excited a warm controverſy between HOFMANN and his colleagues OWEN GUNTHERUS, CORNELIUS MARTIN, JOHN CASELIUS, and DUNCAN LIDDEL; a controverſy alſo of too much conſequence to be confined within ſuch narrow bounds, and which, accordingly, was carried on in other countries with the ſame fervour. The tumults it excited in *Germany* were appeaſed by the interpoſition of HENRY JULIUS, duke of *Brunſwick*, who, having made a careful inquiry into the nature of this debate, and conſulted the profeſſors of the academy of *Roſtoc* on that ſubject, commanded HOFMANN to retract publicly the invectives he had thrown out againſt philoſophy in his writings and in his academical lectures, and to acknowledge, in the moſt open manner, the harmony and union of ſound philoſophy with true and genuine theology [y].

The ſcience of theology corrected and improved.

XIV. The theological ſyſtem, that now prevails in the Lutheran academies, is not of the ſame tenor or ſpirit with that which was adopted in the infancy of the Reformation. As time and experience are neceſſary to bring all things to perfection, ſo the doctrine of the Lutheran church changed, imperceptibly and by degrees, its original form, and was improved and perfected in many reſpects. This will appear both evident and ſtriking to thoſe who are acquainted with the hiſtory of the doctrines relating to the interpretation of ſcripture, free-will, predeſtination, and other points, and who compare the Lutheran ſyſtems of divinity of an earlier date with thoſe that have been compoſed in modern times. The caſe could not well be otherwiſe. The glorious defenders of religious liberty, to whom we owe the various bleſſings of the Reformation, as they were conducted only by the ſuggeſtions of their natural ſagacity, whoſe advances in the purſuit of knowledge are gradual and progreſſive, could not, at once, behold the truth in all its luſtre, and in all its extent, but, as uſually happens to perſons that have been long accuſtomed to the darkneſs of ignorance, their approaches towards knowledge were but ſlow, and their views of things but imperfect. The Lutherans were greatly aſſiſted both in correcting and illuſtrating the articles of their faith, partly by the controverſies they were obliged to carry on with the Roman-catholic doctors, and the diſciples of ZUINGLE and CALVIN; and partly by the inteſtine diviſions that reigned among themſelves, of which an account ſhall be given in this chapter. They have been abſurdly reproached, on account of this variation in their doctrine, by BOSSUET and other papal writers, who did not conſider that the founders of the Lutheran church never pretended to divine inſpiration; and that it is by diſcovering firſt the errors of others, that the wiſe generally prepare themſelves for the inveſtigation of truth.

---

[y] There is an accurate account of this controverſy, with an enumeration of the writings publiſhed on both ſides of the queſtion, in the *Life of Owen Guntherus*, which is inſerted by MOLLERUS, in his *Cimbria Literata*, tom. i. p. 225.—See alſo JO. HERM. AB ELSWICH, *De fatis Ariſtotelis in Scholis Proteſtant.* § xxvii. p. 76.—And a German work, entitled, GOTTFR. ARNOLD, *Kirchen and Kitzer-Hiſtorie*, p. 947.

The ſtate of exegetic theology.

XV. The firſt and principal object that drew the attention and employed the induſtry of the reformers, was the expoſition and illuſtration of the ſacred writings, which, according to the doctrine of the Lutheran church, contain all the treaſures of celeſtial wiſdom; all things that relate to faith and practice. Hence it happened, that the number of commentators and expoſitors among the Lutherans was equal to that of the eminent and learned doctors that adorned that communion. At the head of them all, LUTHER and MELANCTHON are undoubtedly to be placed; the former, on account of the ſagacity and learning, diſcovered in his explications of ſeveral portions of ſcripture, and particularly of the Books of MOSES, and the latter, in conſequence of his commentaries on the Epiſtles of St. PAUL, and other learned labours of that kind which are abundantly known. A ſecond claſs of expoſitors, of the ſame communion, obtained alſo great applauſe in the learned world, by their ſucceſsful application to the ſtudy of the Holy Scriptures, in which we may rank MATTHIAS FLACIUS, whoſe *Gloſſary and Key to the ſacred writings* [z] is extremely uſeful in unfolding the meaning of the inſpired penmen; JOHN BUGENHAGIUS, JUSTUS JONAS, ANDREW OSIANDER,

---

[z] The Latin titles are *Gloſſa Scripturæ Sacræ*, and *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ*.

DER, and MARTIN CHEMNITZ, whoſe *Harmonies of the Evangeliſts* are not void of merit. To theſe we may add VICTOR STRIGELIUS and JOACHIM CAMERARIUS, of whom the latter, in his *Commentary on the New Teſtament*, expounds the ſcriptures in a grammatical and critical manner only; and laying aſide all debated points of doctrine and religious controverſy, unfolds the ſenſe of each term, and the ſpirit of each phraſe, by the rules of criticiſm and the genius of the ancient languages, in which he was a very uncommon proficient.

The reſpective merits of the ſacred interpreters.

XVI. All theſe expoſitors and commentators abandoned the method of the ancient interpreters, who, neglecting the plain and evident purport of the words of ſcripture, were perpetually torturing their imaginations, in order to find out a myſterious ſenſe in each word or ſentence, or were hunting after inſipid alluſions and chimerical applications of ſcripture-paſſages, to objects which never entered into the views of the inſpired writers. On the contrary, their principal zeal and induſtry were employed in inveſtigating the natural force and ſignification of each expreſſion, in conſequence of that golden rule* of interpretation inculcated by LUTHER, *That there is no more than one ſenſe annexed to the words of ſcripture throughout all the Books of the Old and New Teſtament* [a]. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the examples exhibited by theſe judicious expoſitors were far from being univerſally followed. Many, labouring under the old and inveterate diſeaſe of an irregular fancy and a ſcanty judgment, were ſtill ſeeking for hidden ſignifications and double meanings in the expreſſions of Holy writ. They were perpetually buſied in twiſting all the prophe-

---

☞ [a] This *golden rule* will be found often defective and falſe, unleſs ſeveral prophetical, parabolical, and figurative expreſſions be excepted in its application.

cies of the Old Teſtament into an intimate connexion with the life, ſufferings, and tranſactions of JESUS CHRIST; and were over-ſagacious in finding out, in the hiſtory of the patriarchal and Jewiſh churches, the types and figures of the events that have happened in modern, and that may yet happen in future times. In all this they diſcovered more imagination than judgment; more wit than wiſdom. Be that as it may, all the expoſitors of this age may be divided, methinks with propriety enough, into two claſſes, with LUTHER at the head of the one, and MELANCTHON preſiding in the other. Some commentators followed the example of the former, who, after a plain and familiar explication of the ſenſe of ſcripture, applied its deciſions to the fixing of controverted points, and to the illuſtration of the doctrines and duties of religion. Others diſcovered a greater propenſity to the method of the latter, who firſt divided the diſcourſes of the ſacred writers into ſeveral parts, explained them according to the rules of rhetoric, and afterwards proceeded to a more ſtrict and almoſt a literal expoſition of each part, taken ſeparately, applying the reſult, as rarely as was poſſible, to points of doctrine or matters of controverſy.

Concerning the didactic theology or doctrine of the Lutheran church.

XVII. Complete ſyſtems of theology were far from being numerous in this century. MELANCTHON, the moſt eminent of all the Lutheran doctors, collected and digeſted the doctrines of the church, which he ſo eminently adorned, into a body of divinity, under the vague title of *Loci Communes*, i. e. *A Common Place Book of Theology*. This compilation, which was afterwards, at different times, reviewed, corrected, and enlarged by its author, was in ſuch high repute during this century, and even in ſucceeding times, that it was conſidered as an univerſal model of doctrine for all thoſe, who either inſtructed the people by their public diſcourſes, or promoted the knowledge of religion by their writings [b]. The title, prefixed to this performance, indicates ſufficiently the method, or rather the irregularity, that reigns in the arrangement of its materials; and ſhews that it was not the deſign of MELANCTHON to place the various truths of religion in that ſyſtematical concatenation, and that ſcientific order and connexion, that are obſerved by the philoſophers in their demonſtrations and diſcourſes, but to propoſe them with freedom and ſimplicity, as they preſented themſelves to his view. Accordingly, in the firſt editions of the book under conſideration, the method obſerved, both in delineating and illuſtrating theſe important truths, is extremely plain, and is neither loaded with the terms, the definitions, nor the diſtinctions, that abound in the writings of the philoſophers. Thus did the Lutheran doctors, in the firſt period of the riſing church, renounce and avoid, in imitation of the great reformer whoſe name they bear, all the abſtruſe reaſoning and ſubtile diſcuſſions of the ſcholaſtic doctors. But the ſophiſtry of their adverſaries, and their perpetual debates with the artful champions of the church of *Rome*, engaged them by degrees, as has been already obſerved, to change their language and their methods of reaſoning; ſo that, in proceſs of time, the ſimplicity that had reigned in their theological ſyſtems, and in their manner of explaining the truths of religion, almoſt totally diſappeared. Even MELANCTHON himſelf fell imperceptibly into the new method, or rather into the old method revived, and enlarged the ſubſequent editions of his *Loci Communes*, by the addition of ſeveral philoſophical illuſtrations, deſigned to expoſe the fallacious reaſonings of the Roman-catholic doctors. As yet, however, the diſcuſſions of philoſophy were but ſparingly uſed, and the unintelligible jargon of the ſchoolmen was kept at a certain diſtance, and ſeldom borrowed. But when the founders of the Lutheran church were removed by death, and the Jeſuits attacked the principles of the Reformation with redoubled animoſity, armed with the intricate and perplexing dialectic of the ſchools; then, indeed, the ſcene changed, and theology aſſumed another aſpect. The ſtratagem employed by the Jeſuits corrupted our doctors, induced them to revive that intricate and abſtruſe manner of defending and illuſtrating religious truth that LUTHER and his aſſociates had rejected, and to introduce, into the plain and artleſs paths of theology, all the thorns and thiſtles, all the dark and devious labyrinths of the ſcholaſtic philoſophy. This unhappy change was deeply lamented by ſeveral divines of eminent piety and learning about the commencement of the ſeventeenth century, who regretted the loſs of that amiable ſimplicity that is the attendant on divine truth; but they could not prevail upon the profeſſors, in the different univerſities, to ſacrifice the jargon of the ſchools to the dictates of common ſenſe, nor to return to the plain, ſerious, and unaffected method of teaching theology that had been introduced by LUTHER. Theſe obſtinate doctors pleaded neceſſity in behalf of their ſcholaſtic divinity, and looked upon this pretended neceſſity as ſuperior to all authorities, and all examples, however reſpectable.

---

[b] See Jo. FRANC. BUDDEUS, *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. i. § xiii. tom. i. p. 381.

The ſtate of morality among the Lutherans.

XVIII. Thoſe who are ſenſible of the intimate connexion that there is between faith and practice, between the truths and duties of religion, will eaſily perceive the neceſſity that there was of reforming the corrupt morality, as well as the ſuperſtitious doctrines, of the church of *Rome*. It is therefore natural, that the ſame perſons, who had ſpirit enough to do the one, ſhould think themſelves obliged to attempt the other. This they accordingly attempted, and not without a certain degree of ſucceſs; for it may be affirmed, with truth, that there is more genuine piety and more excellent rules of conduct in the few practical productions of LUTHER, MELANCTHON, WELLER, and RIVIUS, to mention no more, than are to be found in the innumerable volumes of all the ancient *Caſuiſts* and *Moraliſers* [c], as they are called in the barbarous language of theſe remote periods. It is not, however, meant even to inſinuate, that the notions of theſe great men concerning the important ſcience of morality were either ſufficiently accurate or extenſive. It appears, on the contrary, from the various debates that were carried on during this century, concerning the duties and obligations of Chriſtians, and from the anſwers that were given by famous caſuiſts to perſons perplexed with religious ſcruples, that the true *principles* of morality were not as yet fixed with perſpicuity and preciſion, the agreement or difference between the laws of nature and the precepts of Chriſtianity ſufficiently examined and determined, nor the proper diſtinctions made between thoſe parts of the goſpel-diſpenſation, which are agreeable to right reaſon, and thoſe that are beyond its reach and comprehenſion. Had not the number of adverſaries, with whom the Lutheran doctors were obliged to contend, given them perpetual employment in the field of controverſy, and robbed them of that precious leiſure which they might have conſecrated to the advancement of real piety and vir-

---

☞ [c] The moral writers of this century were called *Moraliſantes*, a barbarous term, of which the Engliſh word *Moraliſers* bears ſome reſemblance.

tue, they would certainly have been free from the defects now mentioned, and would, perhaps, have equalled the beſt moral writers of modern times. This conſideration will alſo diminiſh our wonder at a circumſtance, which otherwiſe might ſeem ſurpriſing, that none of the famous Lutheran doctors attempted to give a regular ſyſtem of morality. MELANCTHON himſelf, whoſe exquiſite judgment rendered him peculiarly capable of reducing into a compendious ſyſtem the elements of every ſcience, never ſeems to have thought of treating morals in this manner; but has inſerted, on the contrary, all his practical rules and inſtructions under the theological articles that relate to the *law*, *ſin*, *free-will*, *faith*, *hope*, and *charity*.

Polemic or controverſial theology.

XIX. All the divines of this century were educated in the ſchool of controverſy, and ſo trained up to ſpiritual war, that an eminent theologian, and a bold and vehement diſputant, were conſidered as ſynonymous terms. It could ſcarcely, indeed, be otherwiſe, in an age when foreign quarrels and inteſtine diviſions of a religious nature threw all the countries of *Europe* into a ſtate of agitation, and obliged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in action, or at leaſt in a poſture of defence. Theſe champions of the Reformation were not, however, all animated with the ſame ſpirit, nor did they attack and defend with the ſame arms. Such of them as were contemporary with LUTHER, or lived near his time, were remarkable for the ſimplicity of their reaſoning, and attacked their adverſaries with no other arguments than thoſe which they drew from the declarations of the inſpired writers, and the deciſions of the ancient fathers. Towards the latter end of the century this method was conſiderably changed, and we ſee thoſe doctors, who were its chief ornaments, reinforcing their cauſe with the ſuccours of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, and thus loſing, in point of perſpicuity and evidence, what they gained in point of ſubtilty and imagined ſcience. It is true, as has been already obſerved more than once, that they were too naturally, though inconſiderately, led to adopt this method of diſputing by the example of their adverſaries the Roman catholics. The latter having learnt, by a diſagreeable and diſcouraging experience, that their cauſe was unable to ſupport that plain and perſpicuous method of reaſoning, that is the proper teſt of religious and moral truth, had recourſe to ſtratagem when evidence failed, and involved both their arguments and their opinions in the dark and intricate mazes of the ſcholaſtic philoſophy; and it was this that engaged the proteſtant doctors to change their weapons, and to employ methods of defence unworthy of the glorious cauſe in which they had embarked.

The ſpirit of zeal that animated the Lutheran divines was, generally ſpeaking, very far from being tempered by a ſpirit of charity. If we except MELANCTHON, in whom a predominant mildneſs and ſweetneſs of natural temper triumphed over the contagious ferocity of the times, all the diſputants of this century diſcovered too much bitterneſs and animoſity in their tranſactions and in their writings. LUTHER himſelf appears at the head of this ſanguine tribe, who he far ſurpaſſed in invectives and abuſe, treating his adverſaries with the moſt brutal aſperity, and ſparing neither rank nor condition, however elevated or reſpectable they might be. It muſt indeed be confeſſed, that the criminal nature of this aſperity and vehemence will be much alleviated, when they are conſidered in one point of view with the genius of theſe barbarous times, and the odious cruelty and injuſtice of the virulent enemies, whom the oppreſſed reformers were called to encounter. When the impartial inquirer conſiders the abominable calumnies that were laviſhed on the authors and inſtruments of the Reformation; when he reflects upon the horrors of fire and ſword employed, by blood-thirſty and bigotted tyrants, to extirpate and deſtroy thoſe good men whom they wanted arguments to perſuade and convince; will not his heart burn with a generous indignation? and will he not think it in ſome meaſure juſt, that ſuch horrid proceedings ſhould be repreſented in their proper colours, and be ſtigmatized by ſuch expreſſions as are ſuited to their demerit?

Three periods muſt be diſtinguiſhed in the hiſtory of the Lutheran church.

XX. In order to form a juſt idea of the internal ſtate of the Lutheran church, and of the revolutions and changes that have happened in it, with their true ſprings and real cauſes, it is neceſſary to conſider the hiſtory of that church under three diſtinct periods. The *firſt* of theſe extends from the commencement of the Reformation to the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546. The *ſecond* takes in the ſpace of time elapſed between the death of LUTHER and that of MELANCTHON, and conſequently terminates in the year 1560; while the remainder of the century is comprehended in the third period.

The FIRST PERIOD.

DURING the *Firſt* period, all things were tranſacted in the Lutheran church in a manner conformable to the ſentiments, counſels, and orders of LUTHER. This eminent reformer, whoſe undaunted reſolution, and amazing credit and authority, rendered him equal to the moſt arduous attempts, eaſily ſuppreſſed the commotions and diſſenſions that aroſe from time to time in the church, and did not ſuffer the ſects, that ſeveral had attempted to form in its boſom, to gather ſtrength, or to arrive at any conſiderable degree of conſiſtence and maturity. The natural conſequence of this was, that, during the life of that great man, the internal ſtate of the Lutheran church was a ſtate of tolerable tranquillity and repoſe; and all ſuch as attempted to foment diviſions, or to introduce any eſſential changes, were either ſpeedily reduced to ſilence, or obliged to retire from the new community.

Debates between Luther and the Fanatics that troubled the church during the firſt period.

XXI. The infancy of this church was troubled by an impetuous rabble of wrong-headed Fanatics, who introduced the utmoſt confuſion wherever they had occaſion to ſpread their peſtilential errors, and who pretended that they had received a divine inſpiration, authoriſing them to erect a new kingdom of CHRIST, in which ſin and corruption were to have no place. The leaders of this turbulent and riotous ſect were MUNZER, STORCHIUS, STUBNER, and others, partly Swiſs, and partly Germans, who kindled the flame of diſcord and rebellion in ſeveral parts of *Europe*, and chiefly in *Germany*, and excited among the ignorant multitude tumults and commotions, which, though leſs violent in ſome places than in others, were, nevertheleſs, formidable wherever they appeared [d]. The hiſtory of this ſeditious band is full of obſcurity and confuſion. A regular, full, and accurate account of it neither has, nor could well be, committed to writing; ſince, on the one hand, the opinions and actions of theſe Fanatics were a motley chaos of inconſiſtencies and contradictions, and, on the other, the age, in which they lived, produced few writers who had either the leiſure or the capacity to obſerve with diligence,

---

[d] JO. BAPTISTA OTTIUS, in his *Annales Anabaptiſt. p.* 8. has collected a conſiderable number of facts relating to theſe fanatical commotions, which are alſo mentioned by all the writers of the Hiſtory of the Reformation.

gence, or to relate with accuracy, commotions and tumults of this extraordinary kind. It is however certain, that, from the moſt profligate and abandoned part of this enthuſiaſtical multitude, thoſe ſeditious armies were formed, which kindled in *Germany* the *War of the Peaſants*, and afterwards ſeized upon the city of *Munſter*, involving the whole province of *Weſtphalia* in the moſt dreadful calamities. It is alſo well known, that the better part of this motley tribe, terrified by the unhappy and deſerved fate of their unworthy aſſociates, whom they ſaw extirpated and maſſacred with the moſt unrelenting ſeverity, ſaved themſelves from the ruin of their ſect, and, at length, embraced the communion of thoſe who are called *Mennonites* [e]. The zeal, vigilance, and reſolution of LUTHER happily prevented the diviſions, which the odious diſciples of MUNZER attempted to excite in the church he had founded, and preſerved the giddy and credulous multitude from their ſeductions. And it may be ſafely affirmed, that, had it not been for the vigour and fortitude of this active and undaunted reformer, the Lutheran church would, in its infancy, have fallen a miſerable prey to the enthuſiaſtic fury of theſe deteſtable fanatics [*f*].

Caroloſtadt.

XXII. Fanatics and enthuſiaſts of the kind now deſcribed, while they met with the warmeſt oppoſition from LUTHER, found, on the contrary, in

---

☞ [e] The tumults of the anabaptiſts in *Germany*, and the junction of the better part of them with MENNON, have already been mentioned in a curſory manner, Sect. I. chap. ii. § xxi. For an ample account of the origin, doctrine, and progreſs of the Mennonites, ſee the third chapter of the ſecond part of this third ſection. Cent. xvi.

☞ [*f*] The danger, that threatened the Lutheran church in theſe tumults of the German anabaptiſts, was ſo much the greater on account of the inclination, which MUNZER and STORCK diſcovered, at firſt, for the ſentiments of LUTHER, and the favourable diſpoſition, which CAROLOSTADT ſeemed, for ſome time, to entertain with reſpect to theſe fanatics.

CAROLOSTADT, his colleague, ſuch a credulous attention to their ſeductions, as naturally flattered them with the hopes of his patronage and favour. This divine, who was a native of *Franconia*, was neither deſtitute of learning nor merit; but imprudence and precipitation were the diſtinguiſhed lines of his warm and violent character. Of theſe he gave the moſt evident marks, in the year 1522, when, during the abſence of LUTHER, he excited no ſmall tumult at *Wittemberg*, by ordering the images to be taken out of the churches, and other enterpriſes of a raſh and dangerous nature [g]. This tumult was appeaſed by the ſudden return of LUTHER, whoſe preſence and exhortations calmed the troubled ſpirits of the people; and here muſt we look for the origin of the rupture between him and CAROLOSTADT. For the latter immediately retired from *Wittemberg to Orlamund*, where he not only oppoſed the ſentiments of

---

☞ [g] The reader may perhaps imagine, from Dr. MOSHEIM's account of this matter, that CAROLOSTADT introduced theſe changes merely by his own authority; but this was far from being the caſe; the ſuppreſſion of private maſſes, the removal of images out of the churches, the abolition of the law which impoſed celibacy upon the clergy, which are the changes hinted at by our hiſtorian as *raſh* and *perilous*, were effected by CAROLOSTADT in conjunction with BUGENHAGIUS, MELANCTHON, JONAS AMSDORFF, and others, and were confirmed by the authority of the elector of *Saxony*: So that there is ſome reaſon to apprehend, that one of the principal cauſes of LUTHER's diſpleaſure at theſe changes, was their being introduced in his abſence; unleſs we ſuppoſe that he had not ſo far got rid of the fetters of ſuperſtition, as to be ſenſible of the abſurdity and of the pernicious conſequences of the uſe of images, *&c.* As to the abolition of the law that impoſed celibacy on the clergy, it is well known, that it was the object of his warmeſt approbation. This appears from the following expreſſions in his letter to AMSDORFF: CAROLOSTADII *nuptiæ mire placent: novi puellam: comfortet eum Dominus in bonum exemplum inhibendæ et minuendæ Papiſticæ libidinis.* He confirmed ſoon afterwards this approbation by his own example.

LUTHER concerning the Euchariſt [h], but alſo diſcovered, in ſeveral inſtances, a fanatical turn of mind [i]. He was therefore commanded to leave the electorate of *Saxony*, which he did accordingly, and repaired to *Switzerland*, where he propagated his doctrines, and taught with ſucceſs, firſt at *Zurich*, and afterwards at *Baſil*, retaining ſtill, however, as long as he lived, a favourable diſpoſition towards the ſect of the anabaptiſts, and, in

---

☞ [h] This difference of opinion between CAROLOSTADT and LUTHER concerning the euchariſt, was the true cauſe of the violent rupture between thoſe two eminent men; and it was very little to the honour of the latter. For, however the explication, which the former gave of the words of the inſtitution of the Lord's ſupper, may appear forced, yet the ſentiments he entertained of that ordinance as a commemoration of CHRIST's death, and not as a celebration of his bodily preſence, in conſequence of a *conſubſtantiation* with the bread and wine, are infinitely more rational than the doctrine of LUTHER, which is loaded with ſome of the moſt palpable abſurdities of *tranſubſtantiation*. And if it be ſuppoſed that CAROLOSTADT ſtrained the rule of interpretation too far, when he alleged, that CHRIST pronounced the pronoun *this* (in the words *This is my body)* pointing to his *body*, and not to the *bread*, what ſhall we think of LUTHER's explaining the nonſenſical doctrine of *conſubſtantiation* by the ſimilitude of a red-hot iron, in which two elements are united, as the body of CHRIST is with the bread in the euchariſt? But of this more in its proper place.

☞ [i] This cenſure is with too much truth applicable to CAROLOSTADT.—Though he did not adopt the impious and abominable doctrines of MUNZER and his band (as Dr. MOSHEIM permits the uninſtructed reader to imagine by mentioning, *in general*, as being a friend to theſe fanatics), yet he certainly was chargeable with ſome extravagancies, that were obſervable in the tenets of that wrong-headed tribe. He was for aboliſhing the *civil law*, with the municipal laws and conſtitutions of the German empire, and propoſed ſubſtituting the law of MOSES in their place. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by railing at the academies, declaiming againſt human learning, and other follies.

Great wits to madneſs nearly are allied.

See VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part I. cap. i.—DAN. GERDES, *Vita Caroloſtadii*, in *Miſcell. Groningenſ. novis*, tom. i.

general, to all enthuſiaſtic teachers, who pretended to a divine inſpiration [k]. Thus then did LUTHER, in a ſhort ſpace of time, lay this new ſtorm that the precipitation of CAROLOSTADT had raiſed in the church.

Schwenckfeldt.

XXIII. The reforming ſpirit of CAROLOSTADT, with reſpect to the doctrine of CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt, was not extinguiſhed by his exile, in the Lutheran church. It was revived, on the contrary, by a man of much the ſame turn of mind, a Sileſian knight, and counſellor to the duke of *Lignitz*, whoſe name was GASPAR SCHWENCKFELDT. This nobleman, ſeconded by VALENTINE CRAUTWALD, a man of eminent

---

☞ [k] This affirmation of Dr. MOSHEIM wants much to be modified. In the original it ſtands thus, *Dum vixit vero anabaptiſtarum, et hominum divina viſa jactantium partibus amicum ſeſe oſtendit*, i. e. *as long as he lived, he ſhewed himſelf a friend to the anabaptiſts, and other enthuſiaſts who pretended to divine inſpiration*. But how could our hiſtorian aſſert this without reſtriction, ſince it is well known that CAROLOSTADT, after his baniſhment from *Saxony*, compoſed a treatiſe againſt enthuſiaſm in general, and againſt the extravagant tenets and the violent proceedings of the anabaptiſts in particular? Nay more; this treatiſe was addreſſed to LUTHER, who was ſo affected by it, that, repenting of the unworthy treatment he had given to CAROLOSTADT, he pleaded his cauſe, and obtained from the elector a permiſſion for him to return into *Saxony*. See GERDES, *Vita Carolſtadii*, in *Miſcell. Groningenſ.* After this reconciliation with LUTHER, he compoſed a treatiſe on the euchariſt, which breathes the moſt amiable ſpirit of moderation and humility; and, having peruſed the writings of ZUINGLE, where he ſaw his own ſentiments on that ſubject maintained with the greateſt perſpicuity and force of evidence, he repaired, a ſecond time, to *Zurich*, and from thence to *Baſil*, where he was admitted to the offices of paſtor and profeſſor of divinity, and where, after having lived in the exemplary and conſtant practice of every Chriſtian virtue, he died, amidſt the warmeſt effuſions of piety and reſignation, on the 25th of December, 1541. All this is teſtified ſolemnly in a letter of the learned and pious GRYNÆUS of *Baſil*, to PITISCUS, chaplain to the elector Palatine, and ſhews how little credit ought to be given to the aſſertions of the ignorant MORERI, or to the inſinuations of the inſidious BOSSUET.

learning,

Cent. XVI. Sect. III. Part II.

learning, who lived at the court of the prince now mentioned, took notice of many things, which he looked upon as erroneous and defective, in the opinions and rites eſtabliſhed by Luther; and, had not the latter been extremely vigilant, as well as vigorouſly ſupported by his friends and adherents, would have undoubtedly brought about a conſiderable ſchiſm in the church. Every circumſtance in Schwenckfeldt's conduct and appearance was adapted to give him credit and influence. His morals were pure, and his life, in all reſpects, exemplary. His exhortations in favour of true and ſolid piety were warm and perſuaſive, and his principal zeal was employed in promoting it among the people. By this means he gained the eſteem and friendſhip of many learned and pious men both in the Lutheran and Helvetic churches, who favoured his ſentiments, and undertook to defend him againſt all his adverſaries [l]. Notwithſtanding all this he was baniſhed by his ſovereign both from the court and from his country, in the year 1528, only becauſe Zuingle had approved of his opinions concerning the euchariſt, and declared that they did not differ eſſentially from his own. From that time the perſecuted knight wandered from place to place, under various turns of fortune, until death put an end to his trials in the year 1561 [m]. He had founded a ſmall congregation in *Sileſia*, which were perſe-

[l] See Jo. Conr. Fueslini *Centuria* I. *Epiſtolar à Reformatoribus Helveticis Scriptar.* 169. 175. 225. *Muſeum Helvetic.* tom. iv. p. 445.

[m] Jo. Wigandi *Schwenckfeldianiſmus, Lipſ.* 1586, in 4to. —Conr. Schlusselburgi *Catalogi Hæreticor.* lib. x. publiſhed at *Francfort* in the year 1599, in 8vo.—The moſt accurate accounts of this nobleman have been given by Chr. Aug. Salig, in his *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſionis*, tom. iii. lib. xi. p. 951. and by Godf. Arnold, in a German work, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, p. 720. both which authors have pleaded the cauſe of Schwenckfeldt.

cuted and ejected in our times by the popiſh poſſeſſors of that country; but have been reſtored to their former habitations and privileges, civil and religious, ſince the year 1742, by the preſent king of *Pruſſia* [n].

The doctrine of Schwenckfeldt.

XXIV. The upright intentions of SCHWENCKFELDT, and his zeal for the advancement of true piety, deſerve, no doubt, the higheſt commendation; but the ſame thing cannot be ſaid of his prudence and judgment. The good man had a natural propenſity towards fanaticiſm, and fondly imagined that he had received a divine commiſſion to propagate his opinions. He differed from LUTHER, and the other friends of the Reformation, in three points, which it is proper to ſelect from others of leſs conſequence: The *firſt* of theſe points related to the doctrine concerning the euchariſt. SCHWENCKFELDT inverted the following words of CHRIST: *This is my body*, and inſiſted on their being thus underſtood: "*My body is* "THIS, *i. e.* ſuch as this bread which is broken "and conſumed: a true and real food, which "nouriſheth, ſatisfieth, and delighteth the ſoul. "*My blood is* THIS, that is, ſuch in its effects as "the wine, which ſtrengthens and refreſheth the "heart." The poor man imagined that this *wonderful* doctrine had been revealed to him from heaven; which circumſtance alone is a ſufficient demonſtration of his folly.

The *ſecond* point in which he differed from LUTHER, was in his hypotheſis relating to the efficacy of the divine word. He denied, for example, that the *external word*, which is committed to writing in the Holy Scriptures, was endowed with the power of *healing*, *illuminating*, and *renewing* the mind; and he aſcribed this power to

---

[n] See an account of SCHWENCKFELDT's *Confeſſion of Faith*, in JO. CHR. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 457.

the *internal word*, which, according to his notion, was CHRIST himſelf. His diſcourſes, however, concerning this *internal word* were, as uſually happens to perſons of his turn, ſo full of confuſion, obſcurity, and contradiction, that it was difficult to find out what his doctrine really was, and whether or not it reſembled that of the Myſtics and Quakers, or was borrowed from a different ſource.

His doctrine concerning the *human nature* of CHRIST, formed the *third* ſubject of debate between him and the Lutherans. He would not allow CHRIST's human nature, in its exalted ſtate, to be called a *creature*, or a created ſubſtance, as ſuch denomination appeared to him infinitely below its majeſtic dignity, united as it is, in that glorious ſtate, with the divine eſſence. This notion of SCHWENCKFELDT bears a remarkable affinity to the doctrine of EUTYCHES, which, however, he profeſſed to reject; and, in his turn, accuſed thoſe of Neſtorianiſm, who gave the denomination of a *creature* to the human nature of CHRIST.

The Antinomians.

XXV. An intemperate zeal, by ſtraining too far certain truths, turns them into falſehood, or, at leaſt, often renders them the occaſion of the moſt pernicious abuſes. A ſtriking inſtance of this happened during the miniſtry of LUTHER. For, while he was inſiſting upon the neceſſity of imprinting deeply in the minds of the people that doctrine of the goſpel, which repreſents CHRIST's merits as the ſource of man's ſalvation, and while he was eagerly employed in cenſuring and refuting the popiſh doctors, who mixed the *law* and *goſpel* together, and repreſented eternal happineſs as the fruit of legal obedience, a fanatic aroſe, who abuſed his doctrine by over-ſtraining it, and thus opened a field for the moſt dangerous errors. This new teacher was JOHN AGRICOLA, a native of *Aiſleben*, and an eminent doctor of the Lutheran church, though chargeable with vanity, preſumption, and artifice. He firſt began to make a noiſe in the year 1538, when from the doctrine of LUTHER, now mentioned, he took occaſion to declaim againſt the *law*, maintaining that it was neither fit to be propoſed to the people as a rule of manners, nor to be uſed in the church as a means of inſtruction; and that the *goſpel* alone was to be inculcated and explained both in the churches and in the ſchools of learning. The followers of AGRICOLA were called *Antinomians*, i. e. *enemies of the law*. But the fortitude, vigilance, and credit of LUTHER ſuppreſſed this ſect in its very infancy; and AGRICOLA, intimidated by the oppoſition of ſuch a reſpectable adverſary, acknowledged and renounced his pernicious ſyſtem. But this recantation does not ſeem to have been ſincere; ſince it is ſaid, that, when his fears were diſpelled by the death of LUTHER, he returned to his errors, and gained proſelytes to his extravagant doctrine [o].

The doctrine of Agricola examined.

XXVI. The tenets of the *Antinomians*, if their adverſaries are to be believed, were of the moſt noxious nature and tendency; for they are ſuppoſed to have taught the looſeſt and moſt diſſolute doctrine in point of morals, and to have maintained, that it was allowable to follow the impulſe of every paſſion, and to tranſgreſs, without reluctance, the divine law, provided the tranſgreſſor *laid hold on* CHRIST, and embraced his merits by a lively faith. Such, at leaſt, is the repreſentation that is generally given of their doctrine; but it ought not to be received with too much credulity. For whoever looks into this

---

[o] See CASPAR. SAGITTARIUS *Introduct. ad Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. i. p. 838.—BAYLE *Dictionnaire*, tom. ii. at the article ISLEBIUS.—CONR. SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalog. Hæret.* lib. iv.—G. ARNOLD. *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, p. 813.

matter with attention and impartiality, will ſoon be perſuaded, that ſuch an abſurd and impious doctrine is unjuſtly laid to the charge of AGRICOLA, and that the principal fault of this preſumptuous man lay in ſome harſh and inaccurate expreſſions, that were ſuſceptible of dangerous and pernicious interpretations. By the term *law* he underſtood the *Ten Commandments*, promulgated under the Moſaic diſpenſation; and he conſidered this law as enacted for the Jews, and not for Chriſtians. He explained, at the ſame time, the term *Goſpel* (which he conſidered as ſubſtituted in the place of the law) in its true and extenſive ſenſe, as comprehending not only the doctrine of the merits of CHRIST rendered ſalutary by faith, but alſo the ſublime precepts of holineſs and virtue, delivered by the divine Saviour as rules of obedience. If, therefore, we follow the intention of AGRICOLA, without interpreting, in a rigorous manner, the uncouth phraſes and improper expreſſions he ſo frequently and ſo injudiciouſly employed, his doctrine will plainly amount to this: "That the *Ten Commandments*, publiſhed during "the miniſtry of MOSES, were chiefly deſigned "for the Jews, and on that account might be "lawfully neglected and laid aſide by Chriſtians; "and that it was ſufficient to explain with "perſpicuity, and to enforce with zeal, what "CHRIST and his apoſtles had taught in the "New Teſtament, both with reſpect to the "means of grace and ſalvation, and the obliga-"tions of repentance and virtue." The greateſt part of the doctors of this century are chargeable with a want of preciſion and conſiſtency in expreſſing their ſentiments; hence their real ſentiments have been miſunderſtood, and opinions have been imputed to them which they never entertained.

The

The SECOND PERIOD.

Debates that aroſe during the ſecond period of the Lutheran church, between the death of Luther and that of Melancthon.

XXVII. AFTER the death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, PHILIP MELANCTHON was placed at the head of the Lutheran doctors. The merit, genius, and talents of this new chief were, undoubtedly, great and illuſtrious; though it muſt, at the ſame time, be confeſſed, that he was inferior to LUTHER in many reſpects [*p*], and more eſpecially in courage, ſtedfaſtneſs, and perſonal authority. His natural temper was ſoft and flexible; his love of peace almoſt exceſſive; and his apprehenſions of the diſpleaſure and reſentment of men in power were ſuch as betrayed a puſillanimous ſpirit. He was ambitious of the eſteem and friendſhip of all with whom he had any intercourſe, and was abſolutely incapable of employing the force of threatenings, or the reſtraints of fear, to ſuppreſs the efforts of religious faction, to keep within due bounds the irregular love of novelty and change, and to ſecure to the church the obedience of its members. It is alſo to be obſerved, that MELANCTHON's ſentiments, on ſome points of no inconſiderable moment, were entirely different from thoſe of LUTHER; and it may not be improper to point out the principal ſubjects on which they adopted different ways of thinking.

In the *firſt* place, MELANCTHON was of opinion, that, for the ſake of peace and concord, many things

---

☞ [*p*] It would certainly be very difficult to point out the *many reſpects* in which Dr. MOSHEIM affirms that LUTHER was ſuperior to MELANCTHON. For if the ſingle article of courage and firmneſs of mind be excepted, I know no other reſpect in which MELANCTHON is not ſuperior, or at leaſt equal, to LUTHER. He was certainly his equal in piety and virtue, and much his ſuperior in learning, judgment, meekneſs, and humanity.

things might be connived at and tolerated in the church of *Rome*, which LUTHER conſidered as abſolutely inſupportable. The former carried ſo far the ſpirit of toleration and indulgence, as to diſcover no reluctance againſt retaining the ancient form of eccleſiaſtical government, and ſubmitting to the dominion of the Roman pontif, on certain conditions, and in ſuch a manner, as might be without prejudice to the obligation and authority of all thoſe truths that are clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

A *ſecond* occaſion of a diverſity of ſentiments between theſe two great men was furniſhed by the tenets which LUTHER maintained in oppoſition to the doctrines of the church of *Rome*. Such were his ideas concerning faith, as the *only* cauſe of ſalvation, concerning the neceſſity of good works to our final happineſs, and man's natural incapacity of promoting his own converſion. In avoiding the corrupt notions which were embraced by the Roman-catholic doctors on theſe important points of theology, LUTHER ſeemed, in the judgment of MELANCTHON, to lean too much towards the oppoſite extreme [q]. Hence the latter inclined to think, that the ſentiments and expreſſions of his colleague required to be ſomewhat mitigated, leſt they ſhould give a handle to dangerous abuſes, and be perverted to the propagation of pernicious errors.

It may be obſerved, *thirdly*, that though MELANCTHON adopted the ſentiments of LUTHER in

---

☞ [q] It is certain, that LUTHER carried the doctrine of *Juſtification by Faith* to ſuch an exceſſive length, as ſeemed, though perhaps contrary to his intention, to derogate not only from the neceſſity of good works, but even from their obligation and importance. He would not allow them to be conſidered either as the *conditions* or *means* of ſalvation, nor even as a preparation for receiving it.

relation to the euchariſt [r], yet he did not conſider their controverſy with the divines of *Switzerland* on that ſubject, as a matter of ſufficient moment to occaſion a breach of church-communion and fraternal concord between the contending parties. He thought that this happy concord might be eaſily preſerved, by expreſſing the doctrine of the euchariſt, and Christ's preſence in that ordinance, in general and ambiguous terms, which the two churches might explain according to their reſpective ſyſtems.

Such were the ſentiments of Melancthon, which, though he did not entirely conceal during the life of Luther, he delivered, nevertheleſs, with great circumſpection and modeſty, yielding always to the authority of his colleague, for whom he had a ſincere friendſhip, and of whom alſo he ſtood in awe. But no ſooner were the eyes of Luther cloſed, than he inculcated with the greateſt plainneſs and freedom, what he had before only hinted at with timorouſneſs and cau-

---

☞ [r] It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing to hear Dr. Mosheim affirming that Melancthon *adopted the ſentiments of* Luther *in relation to the euchariſt*, when the contrary is well known. It is true, in the writings of Melancthon, which were publiſhed before the year 1529, or 1530, there are paſſages, which ſhew that he had not, as yet, thoroughly examined the controverſy relating to the nature of Christ's preſence in the euchariſt. It is alſo true, that during the diſputes carried on between Westphal and Calvin, after the death of Luther, concerning the *real preſence*, he did not declare himſelf in an open manner for either ſide (which, however, is a preſumptive proof of his leaning to that of Calvin), but expreſſed his ſorrow at theſe diviſions, and the ſpirit of animoſity by which they were inflamed. But whoever will be at the pains to read the letters of Melancthon to Calvin upon this ſubject, or thoſe extracts of them that are collected by Hospinian, in the ſecond volume of his *Hiſtoria Sacramentaria*, p. 428. will be perſuaded, that he looked upon the doctrine of *Conſubſtantiation* not only as erroneous, but even as idolatrous; and that nothing but the fear of inflaming the preſent diviſions, and of not being ſeconded, prevented him from declaring his ſentiments openly. See alſo *Dictionnaire de* Bayle, *art.* Melancthon, note L.

tion. The eminent rank MELANCTHON held among the Lutheran doctors rendered this bold manner of proceeding extremely diſagreeable to many. His doctrine accordingly was cenſured and oppoſed; and thus the church was deprived of the tranquillity it had enjoyed under LUTHER, and exhibited an unhappy ſcene of animoſity, contention, and diſcord.

The adiaphoriſtic controverſy, or the diſpute concerning matters of an indifferent nature.

XXVIII. The riſe of theſe unhappy diviſions muſt be dated from the year 1548, when CHARLES V. attempted to impoſe upon the Germans the famous edict, called the *Interim.* MAURICE, the new elector of *Saxony*, deſirous to know how far ſuch an edict ought to be reſpected in his dominions, aſſembled the doctors of *Wittemberg* and *Leipſic* in the laſt mentioned city, and propoſed this nice and critical ſubject to their ſerious examination. Upon this occaſion MELANCTHON, complying with the ſuggeſtions of that lenity and moderation that were the great and leading principles in the whole courſe of his conduct and actions, declared it as his opinion, that, in matters of an *indifferent* nature, compliance was due to the imperial edicts [*s*]. But in the claſs of matters indifferent, this great man and his aſſociates placed many things which had appeared of the higheſt importance to LUTHER, and could not, of conſequence, be conſidered as indifferent by his true diſciples [*t*]. For he regarded as

---

[*s*] The piece in which MELANCTHON and his aſſociates delivered their ſentiments relating to things *indifferent*, is commonly called, in the German language, *Das Leipziger Interim*, and was republiſhed at *Leipſic* in 1721, by BIEKIUS, in a work, entitled, *Das dreyfache Interim.*

☞ [*t*] If they only are the *true diſciples* of LUTHER, who ſubmit to his judgment, and adopt his ſentiments in theological matters, many doctors of that communion, and our hiſtorian among the reſt, muſt certainly be ſuppoſed to have forfeited that title, as will abundantly appear hereafter. Be that as it may, MELANCTHON can ſcarcely, if at all, be juſtified in placing as ſuch, the doctrine of *juſtification by faith alone*; the *neceſſity of good works to eternal ſalvation*; the *number of the ſacraments*; the *juriſdiction* claimed by the *pope and the biſhops*; *extreme unction*; the obſervation of certain religious feſtivals, and ſeveral ſuperſtitious rites and ceremonies. Hence aroſe that violent ſcene of contention and diſcord, that was commonly called the *Adiaphoriſtic* [u] controverſy, which divided the church during many years, and proved highly detrimental to the progreſs of the Reformation. The defenders of the primitive doctrines of Lutheraniſm, with FLACIUS at their head, attacked with incredible bitterneſs and fury the doctors of *Wittemberg* and *Leipſic*, and particularly MELANCTHON, by whoſe counſel and influence every thing relating to the *Interim* had been conducted, and accuſed them of apoſtacy from the true religion. MELANCTHON, on the other hand, ſeconded by the zeal of his friends and diſciples, juſtified his conduct with the utmoſt ſpirit and vigour [w]. In this unlucky debate the two following queſtions were principally diſcuſſed: Firſt, *whether the matter that ſeemed indifferent to* MELANCTHON *were ſo in reality?* This his adverſaries obſtinately denied [x]. Secondly, *whether, in things of an indifferent nature, and in which the intereſts of religion*

---

placing in the claſs of things indifferent the doctrines relating to *faith* and *good works*, which are the fundamental points of the Chriſtian religion, and, if I may uſe ſuch an expreſſion, the very *hinges* on which the goſpel turns.

☞ [u] This controverſy was called *Adiaphoriſtick*; and MELANCTHON and his followers *Adiaphoriſts*, from the Greek word ἀδιάφορος, which ſignifies *indifferent*.

[w] SCHLUSSENBURGI *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib xiii.—ARNOLD's German work, entitled, *Kirchen und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvi. p. 816.—SALIG. *Hiſtor. Aug. Confeſſ.* vol. i. p. 611.—The German work entitled, *Unſchuldige Nachrichten*, A. 1702, p. 339. 393.—LUC. OSIANDRI *Epitome Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Centur.* xvi. p. 502.

☞ [x] See above, note [t].

are not eſſentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth?

A controverſy ſet on foot by George Major, concerning the neceſſity of good works.

XXIX. This debate concerning things *indifferent* became, as might well have been expected, a fruitful ſource of other controverſies, which were equally detrimental to the tranquillity of the church, and to the cauſe of the Reformation. The firſt to which it gave riſe, was the warm diſpute concerning the *neceſſity of good works*, that was carried on with ſuch ſpirit againſt the rigid Lutherans, by George Major, an eminent teacher of theology at *Wittemberg*. Melancthon had long been of opinion, that the *neceſſity of good works, in order to the attainment of everlaſting ſalvation,* might be aſſerted and taught, as conformable to the truths revealed in the goſpel; and both he and his colleagues declared this to be their opinion, when they were aſſembled at *Leipſic*, in the year 1548, to examine the famous edict already mentioned [y]. This declaration was ſeverely cenſured by the rigid diſciples of Luther, as contrary to the doctrine and ſentiments of their chief, and as conformable both to the tenets and intereſts of the church of *Rome*; but it found an able defender in Major, who, in the year 1552, maintained the *neceſſity of good works* againſt the extravagant aſſertions of Amsdorf. Hence aroſe a new controverſy between the *rigid* and *moderate* Lutherans, which was carried on with that keenneſs and animoſity, that were peculiar to all debates of a religious nature during this century. In the courſe of this warm debate, Amsdorf was ſo far tranſported and infatuated by his exceſſive zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to maintain, that *good works were an impediment to ſalvation*; from which imprudent and odious expreſſion the flame of controverſy received new fuel, and broke forth with redoubled fury. On the other hand, MAJOR complained of the malice or ignorance of his adverſaries, who explained his doctrine in a manner quite different from that in which he intended it ſhould be underſtood; and, at length, he renounced it entirely, that he might not appear fond of wrangling, or be looked upon as a diſturber of the peace of the church. This ſtep did not, however, put an end to the debate, which was ſtill carried on, until it was terminated at laſt by the *Form of concord* [z].

---

[y] The *Interim* of Charles V.

The ſynergiſtical controverſy.

XXX. From the ſame ſource that produced the diſpute concerning the neceſſity of good works, aroſe the *ſynergiſtical* controverſy. The *Synergiſts* [a], whoſe doctrine was almoſt the ſame with that of the Semi-pelagians, denied that God was the *only* agent in the converſion of ſinful man; and affirmed, that man *co-operated* with divine grace in the accompliſhment of this ſalutary purpoſe. Here alſo MELANCTHON renounced the doctrine of LUTHER; at leaſt, the terms he employs, in expreſſing his ſentiments concerning this intricate ſubject, are ſuch as LUTHER would have rejected with horror; for in the conference at *Leipſic*, already mentioned, the former of theſe great men did not ſcruple to affirm, that *God drew to himſelf, and converted, adult perſons in ſuch a manner, that the powerful impreſſion of his grace was accompanied with a certain correſpondent action of their will.* The friends and diſciples of MELANCTHON adopted this manner of ſpeaking, and uſed the expreſſions of their maſter to deſcribe the nature of the divine agency in man's converſion. But this repreſentation of the matter was far from being agreeable to the rigid Lutherans. They looked upon it as ſubverſive of the true and genuine doctrine of LUTHER, relating to the *abſolute ſervitude* of the human will [*b*], and the total *inability* of man to do any good action, or to bear any part in his own converſion; and hence they oppoſed the *Synergiſts*, or Semi-pelagians, with the utmoſt animoſity and bitterneſs. The principal champions in this theological conflict were SIRIGELIUS, who defended the ſentiments of MELANCTHON with ſingular dexterity and perſpicuity, and FLACIUS, who maintained the ancient doctrine of LUTHER: of theſe doctors, as alſo the ſubject of their debate, a farther account will be given preſently [*c*].

---

[z] SCHLUSSENBURG, lib. vii. *Catal. Hæreticor.*—ARNOLDI *Hiſt. Eccleſiæ*, lib. xvi. cap. xxvii. p. 822.—JO. MUSÆI *Prælection. in Form. Concord.* p. 181.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria* JOH. WESTPHALI, p. 166.

☞ [a] As this controverſy turned upon the *co-operation* of the human will with the divine grace, the perſons, who maintained this joint-agency, were called *Synergiſts*, from a Greek word (συνεργεια), which ſignifies *co-operation*.

Flacius, by his intemperate zeal, excites many diviſions in the church.

XXXI. During theſe diſſenſions, a new academy was founded at *Jena* by the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar*, the ſons of the famous JOHN FREDERICK, whoſe unſucceſsful wars with the emperor CHARLES V. had involved him in ſo many calamities, and deprived him of his electorial dominions. The noble founders of this academy, having deſigned it for the bulwark of the proteſtant religion, as it was taught and inculcated by LUTHER, were particularly careful in chooſing ſuch profeſſors and divines as were remarkable for their attachment

---

☞ [*b*] The doctrines of *abſolute predeſtination, irreſiſtible grace*, and *human impotence*, were never carried to a more exceſſive length, nor maintained with a more virulent obſtinacy, by any divine, than they were by LUTHER. But in theſe times he has very few followers in this reſpect, even among thoſe that bear his name. But of this more hereafter.

[*c*] See SCHLUSSENBURG *Catal. Hæreticor.* lib. v.—G. ARNOLD. *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. xvi. cap. xxviii. p. 826.—BAYLE *Dictionnaire*, at the article SYNERGISTES.—SALIG. *Hiſtor. Auguſt. Confeſſ.* vol. iii. p. 474. 587. 880.—MUSÆI *Prælect. in Formulam Concordiæ*, p. 88.

to the genuine doctrine of that great reformer, and their averſion to the ſentiments of thoſe moderate Lutherans, who had attempted, by certain modifications and corrections, to render it leſs harſh and diſguſting. And as none of the Lutheran doctors were ſo eminent, on account of their uncharitable and intemperate zeal for this ancient doctrine, as MATTHEW FLACIUS, the virulent enemy of MELANCTHON, and all the *Philippiſts*, he was appointed, in the year 1557, profeſſor of divinity at *Jena*. The conſequences of this nomination were, indeed, deplorable. For this turbulent and impetuous man, whom nature had formed with an uncommon propenſity to foment diviſions and propagate diſcord, did not only revive all the ancient controverſies that had diſtracted the church, but alſo excited new debates; and ſowed, with ſuch avidity and ſucceſs, the ſeeds of contention between the divines of *Weimar* and thoſe of the electorate of *Saxony*, that a fatal ſchiſm in the Lutheran church was apprehended by many of its wiſeſt members [*d*]. And, indeed, this ſchiſm would have been inevitable, if the machinations and intrigues of FLACIUS had produced the deſired effect. For, in the year 1559, he perſuaded the dukes of *Saxe-Weimar* to order a *refutation* of the errors that had crept into the Lutheran church, and particularly of thoſe that were imputed to the followers of MELANCTHON, to be drawn up with care, to be promulgated by authority, and to be placed among the other religious edicts and articles of faith that were in force in their dominions. But this pernicious deſign of dividing the church proved abortive; for the other Lutheran princes, who acted from the true and genuine principles of the Reformation, diſapproved of this ſeditious book, from a juſt apprehenſion of its tendency to increaſe the preſent troubles, and to augment, inſtead of diminiſhing, the calamities of the church [*e*].

[*d*] See the famous letter of AUGUSTUS, elector of *Saxony*, concerning FLACIUS and his malignant attempts, which is publiſhed by ARN. GREVIUS, in his *Memoria Joh. Weſtphali*, p. 393.

The conteſt between Flacius and Strigelius.

XXXII. This theological incendiary kindled the flame of diſcord and perſecution even in the church of *Saxe-Weimar*, and in the univerſity of *Jena*, to which he belonged, by venting his fury againſt STRIGELIUS [*f*], the friend and diſciple of MELANCTHON. This moderate divine adopted, in many things, the ſentiments of his maſter, and maintained, particularly, in his public lectures, that the *human will*, when under the influence of the *divine grace* leading it to repentance, was not totally *unactive*, but bore a certain part in the ſalutary work of its converſion. In conſequence of this doctrine, he was accuſed by FLACIUS of *Synergiſm*, at the court of *Saxe-Weimar*; and by the order of the prince was caſt into priſon, where he was treated with ſeverity and rigour. He was at length delivered from this confinement in the year 1562, and allowed to reſume his former vocation, in conſequence of a declaration of his real ſentiments, which, as he alleged, had been greatly miſrepreſented. This declaration, however, did not either decide or terminate the controverſy; ſince STRIGELIUS ſeemed rather to conceal his erroneous ſentiments [*g*] under ambiguous expreſſions, than to renounce them entirely. And indeed he was ſo conſcious of this himſelf, that, to avoid being involved in new calamities and perſecutions, he retired from *Jena* to *Leipſic*, and from *Leipſic* to *Heidelberg*, where he ſpent the remainder of his days; and appeared ſo unſettled in his religious opinions, that it is really doubtful whether he is to be placed among the followers of LUTHER or CALVIN.

[*e*] SALIG, *Hiſtoria Auguſt. Confeſſ.* vol. iii. p. 476.

[*f*] See the writers cited in the preceding notes; and alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article STRIGELIUS.

☞ [*g*] The ſentiments of STRIGELIUS were not, I have reaſon to believe, very *erroneous* in the judgment of Dr. MOSHEIM, nor are they ſuch in the eſtimation of the greateſt part of the Lutheran doctors at this day.

Some particulars of the diſpute carried on by Flacius at *Saxe-Weimar*.

XXXIII. The iſſue, however, of this controverſy, which FLACIUS had kindled with ſuch an intemperate zeal, proved highly detrimental to his own reputation and influence in particular, as well as to the intereſts of the Lutheran church in general. For while this vehement diſputant was aſſailing his adverſary with an inconſiderate ardour, he exaggerated ſo exceſſively the ſentiments, which he looked upon as orthodox, as to maintain an opinion of the moſt monſtrous and deteſtable kind; an opinion which made him appear, even in the judgment of his warmeſt friends, an odious *heretic*, and a corrupter of the true religion. In the year 1560, a public diſpute was held at *Weimar*, between him and STRIGELIUS, concerning the natural powers and faculties of the human mind, and their influence in the converſion and conduct of the true Chriſtian. In this conference the latter ſeemed to attribute to unaſſiſted nature too much, and the former too little. The one looked upon the fall of man as an event that extinguiſhed, in the human mind, every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing behind it but univerſal darkneſs and corruption. The other maintained, that this degradation of the powers of nature was by no means univerſal or entire; that the will retained ſtill ſome propenſity to worthy purſuits, and a certain degree of activity that rendered it capable of attainments in virtue. STRIGELIUS, who was well acquainted with the wiles of a captious philoſophy, propoſed to defeat his adverſary by puzzling him, and addreſſed to him, with that view, the following queſtion: *Whether original ſin, or the corrupt habit which the human ſoul contracted by the fall, is to be placed in the claſs of* SUBSTANCES *or* ACCIDENTS? FLACIUS anſwered with unparalleled imprudence and temerity, that it belonged to the former; and maintained, to his dying hour, this moſt extravagant and dangerous propoſition, that *original ſin is the very ſubſtance of human nature.* Nay, ſo invincible was the obſtinacy with which he perſevered in this ſtrange doctrine, that he choſe to renounce all worldly honours and advantages rather than depart from it. It was condemned by the greateſt and ſoundeſt part of the Lutheran church, as a doctrine that bore no ſmall affinity to that of the Manichæans. But, on the other hand, the merit, erudition, and credit of FLACIUS procured him many reſpectable patrons and able defenders among the moſt learned doctors of the church, who embraced his ſentiments, and maintained his cauſe with the greateſt ſpirit and zeal; of whom the moſt eminent were CYRIAC SPANGENBERG, CHRISTOPHER IRENÆUS, and CÆLESTINE [b].

The conſequences that aroſe from the imprudence of Flacius.

XXXIV. It is ſcarcely poſſible to imagine how much the Lutheran church ſuffered from this new diſpute in all thoſe places where its contagion had reached, and how detrimental it was to the progreſs of Lutheraniſm among thoſe who ſtill adhered to the religion of *Rome.* For the flame of diſcord ſpread far and wide; it was communicated even to thoſe churches which were erected in popiſh countries, and particularly in the Auſtrian territories, under the gloomy ſhade of a dubious toleration; and it ſo animated the Lutheran paſtors, though ſurrounded on all ſides by their cruel adverſaries, that they could neither be reſtrained by the dictates of prudence, nor by the ſenſe of danger [*i*]. Many are of opinion, that an ignorance of philoſophical diſtinctions and definitions threw FLACIUS inconſiderately into the extravagant hypotheſis he maintained with ſuch obſtinacy, and that his greateſt hereſy was no more than a fooliſh attachment to an unuſual term. But FLACIUS ſeems to have fully refuted this plea in his behalf, by declaring boldly, in ſeveral parts of his writings, that he knew perfectly well the philoſophical ſignification and the whole energy of the word *ſubſtance*, and was by no means ignorant of the conſequences that would be drawn from the doctrine he had embraced [*k*]. Be that as it may, we cannot but wonder at the ſenſeleſs and exceſſive obſtinacy of this turbulent man, who choſe rather to ſacrifice his fortune, and diſturb the tranquillity of the church, than to abandon a word, which was entirely foreign to the ſubject in debate, and renounce an hypotheſis, that was compoſed of the moſt palpable contradictions.

---

[b] SCHLUSSENBURG. *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ii.—*The Life of* FLACIUS, written in German by RITTER, and publiſhed in 8vo at *Francfort,* in the year 1725.—SALIG. *Hiſtor. Aug. Confeſſion,* vol. iii. p. 593.—ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* lib xvi. cap. xxix. p. 829.—MUSÆI *Prælect. in Formul. Concordiæ,* p. 29.—JO. GEORGII LEUCKFELDII *Hiſtoria Spangenbergenſis.*—For a particular account of the diſpute, that was held publicly at *Weimar,* ſee the German work entitled, *Unſchuld Nachricht,* p. 383.

[*i*] See a German work of BERN. RAUPACH, entitled, *Zwiefache Zugabe zu dem Evangeliſch. Oeſterrich.* p. 25. 29. 32. 34. 43. 64. The ſame author ſpeaks of the friends of FLACIUS in *Auſtria*; and particularly of IRENÆUS, in his *Preſbyterol. Auſtriace*, p. 69.—For an account of CÆLESTINE, ſee the German work mentioned at the end of the preceding note.

[*k*] This will appear evident to ſuch as will be at the pains to conſult the letters which WESTPHAL wrote to his friend FLACIUS, in order to perſuade him to abſtain from the uſe of the word *ſubſtance*, with the anſwers of the latter. Theſe *Letters* and ANSWERS are publiſhed by ARNOLD GREVIUS, in his *Memoria* JO. WESTPHALI, p. 186.

The diſputes kindled by Oſiander.

XXXV. The laſt controverſy that we ſhall mention, of thoſe that were occaſioned by the exceſſive lenity of MELANCTHON, was ſet on foot by OSIANDER, in the year 1549, and produced much diſcord and animoſity in the church. Had its firſt founder been yet alive, his influence and authority would have ſuppreſſed in their birth theſe wretched diſputes; nor would OSIANDER, who deſpiſed the moderation of MELANCTHON, have dared either to publiſh or defend his crude and chimerical opinions within the reach of LUTHER. Arrogance and ſingularity were the principal lines in OSIANDER's character; he loved to ſtrike out new notions; but his views ſeemed always involved in an intricate obſcurity. The diſputes that aroſe concerning the *Interim*, induced him to retire from *Nuremberg*, where he had exerciſed the paſtoral charge, to *Konigſberg*, where he was choſen profeſſor of divinity. In this new ſtation he began his academical functions, by propagating notions concerning the *Divine Image*, and the nature of *Repentance*, very different from the doctrine that LUTHER had taught on theſe intereſting ſubjects; and, not contented with this deviation from the common track, he thought proper, in the year 1550, to introduce conſiderable alterations and corrections into the doctrine that had been generally received in the Lutheran church, with reſpect to the means of our *juſtification* before God. When we examine his diſcuſſion of this important point, we ſhall find it much more eaſy to perceive the opinions he rejected, than to underſtand the ſyſtem he had invented or adopted; for, as was but too uſual in this age, he not only expreſſed his notions in an obſcure manner, but ſeemed moreover perpetually in contradiction with himſelf. His doctrine, however, when carefully examined, will appear to amount to the following propoſitions: "CHRIST,

“ conſidered in his *human nature only*, could not,
“ by his obedience to the divine law, obtain
“ *juſtification* and pardon for ſinners; neither can
“ we be *juſtified* before God by embracing and
“ applying to ourſelves, through faith, the
“ *righteouſneſs* and obedience of the *man* CHRIST.
“ It is only through that eternal and *eſſential*
“ *righteouſneſs*, which dwells in CHRIST *conſidered*
“ *as God*, and which reſides in his divine nature,
“ that is united to the human, that mankind can
“ obtain complete *juſtification*. Man becomes a
“ partaker of this *divine righteouſneſs* by faith;
“ ſince it is in conſequence of this uniting prin-
“ ciple that CHRIST dwells in the heart of man,
“ with his divine righteouſneſs; now wherever
“ this divine righteouſneſs dwells, *there* God can
“ behold no ſin, and therefore, when it is preſent
“ with CHRIST in the hearts of the *regenerate*,
“ they are, on its account, conſidered by the
“ Deity as *righteous*, although they be ſinners,
“ Moreover, this *divine* and *juſtifying righteouſneſs*
“ of CHRIST excites the faithful to the purſuit of
“ holineſs, and to the practice of virtue.” This doctrine was zealouſly oppoſed by the moſt eminent doctors of the Lutheran church, and, in a more eſpecial manner, by MELANCTHON and his colleagues. On the other hand, OSIANDER and his ſentiments were ſupported by perſons of conſiderable weight. But, upon the death of this rigid and fanciful divine, the flame of controverſy was cooled, and dwindled by degrees into nothing [l].

XXXVI. The

---

[l] See SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalogus Hæreticor.* lib. vi.—ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. xvi. cap. xxiv. p. 804.—CHRIST. HARTKNOCH. *Preuſſiſche Kirchen-Hiſtorie*, p. 309.—SALIG. *Hiſtoria Auguſt. Confeſſion.* tom. ii. p. 922. The judgment that was formed of this controverſy, by the divines of *Wittemberg*, may be ſeen in the German work, entitled, *Unſchuldige*

The debates excited by Stancarus.

XXXVI. The doctrine of OSIANDER, concerning the method of being juſtified before God, appeared ſo abſurd to STANCARUS, profeſſor of Hebrew at *Konigſberg*, that he undertook to refute it. But while this turbulent and impetuous doctor was exerting all the vehemence of his zeal againſt the opinion of his colleague, he was hurried, by his violence, into the oppoſite extreme, and fell into an hypotheſis, that appeared equally groundleſs, and not leſs dangerous in its tendency and conſequences. OSIANDER had maintained, that the man CHRIST, in his character of moral agent, was obliged to obey, for *himſelf*, the divine law, and therefore could not, by the imputation of this obedience, obtain *righteouſneſs* or juſtification for *others*. From hence he concluded, that the Saviour of the world had been empowered, not by his character as *man*, but by his nature as *God*, to make expiation for our ſins, and reconcile us to the favour of an offended Deity. STANCARUS, on the other hand, excluded entirely CHRIST's divine nature from all concern in the *ſatisfaction* he made, and in the *redemption* he procured for offending mortals, and maintained, that the ſacred office of a mediator between God and man belonged to JESUS, conſidered in his human nature alone. Having perceived, however, that this doctrine expoſed him to the enmity of many divines, and even rendered him the object of popular reſentment and indignation, he retired from *Konigſberg* into *Germany*, and from thence into *Poland*,

---

Nachrichten, p. 141. and that of the doctors of *Copenhagen*, in *der Däniſchen Bibliothec*. part vii. p. 150. where there is an ample liſt of the writings publiſhed on this ſubject.—To form a juſt idea of the inſolence and arrogance of OSIANDER, thoſe who underſtand the German language will do well to conſult HISCHIUS, *Nuremberg Interims-Hiſtorie*, p. 44. 59, 60, &c.

Poland, where he excited no ſmall commotions [*m*], and where alſo he concluded his days in the year 1574 [*n*].

The methods that were employed to heal theſe diviſions.

XXXVII. All thoſe who had the cauſe of virtue, and the advancement of the Reformation really at heart, looked with an impatient ardour for an end to theſe bitter and uncharitable contentions; and their deſires of peace and concord in the church were ſtill increaſed by their perceiving the induſtrious aſſiduity with which *Rome* turned theſe unhappy diviſions to the advancement of her intereſts. But during the life of MELANCTHON, who was principally concerned in theſe warm debates, no effectual method could be found to bring them to a concluſion. The death of this great man, which happened in the year 1560, changed, indeed, the face of things, and enabled thoſe who were diſpoſed to terminate the preſent conteſts, to act with more reſolution,

---

[*m*] See a German work of CHR. HARTKNOCH, entitled, *Preuſſiſche Kirken geſchichte*, p. 340.—SCHLUSSELBURGII *Catalog. Hæreticor.* lib. ix.—*Dictionnaire du* BAYLE, at the article STANCARUS.—Before the arrival of STANCARUS at *Konigſberg*, in the year 1548, he had lived for ſome time in *Switzerland*, where alſo he had occaſioned religious diſputes; for he adopted ſeveral doctrines of LUTHER, particularly that concerning the virtue and efficacy of the ſacraments, which were rejected by the Swiſs and Griſons. See the *Muſæum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 484. 490, 491. For an account of the diſturbances he occaſioned in *Poland* in 1556, ſee BULLINGER, in JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria* I. *Epiſtolar. à Reformator. Helvetic. ſcriptar.* p. 371. 459.

☞ [*n*] The main argument alleged by STANCARUS, in favour of his hypotheſis, was this, that, if CHRIST was *mediator* by his divine nature *only*, then it followed evidently, that even conſidered as God, he was inferior to the Father; and thus, according to him, the doctrine of his adverſary OSIANDER led directly to the *Unitarian* ſyſtem. This difficulty, which was preſented with great ſubtilty, engaged many to ſtrike into a middle road, and to maintain that both the divine and human natures of CHRIST were immediately concerned in the work of Redemption.

tion, and a ſurer proſpect of ſucceſs, than had accompanied their former efforts. Hence it was, that, after ſeveral vain attempts, AUGUSTUS, elector of *Saxony*, and JOHN WILLIAM, duke of *Saxe-Weimar*, ſummoned the moſt eminent doctors of both the contending parties to meet at *Altenburg* in the year 1568, and there to propoſe, in an amicable manner, and with a charitable ſpirit, their reſpective opinions, that thus it might be ſeen how far a reconciliation was poſſible, and what was the moſt probable method of bringing it about. But the intemperate zeal and warmth of the diſputants, with other unlucky circumſtances, blaſted the fruits that were expected from this *conference* [o]. Another method of reſtoring tranquillity and union among the members of the Lutheran church was therefore propoſed; and this was, that a certain number of wiſe and moderate divines ſhould be employed in compoſing a *Form* of doctrine, in which all the controverſies, that divided the church, ſhould be terminated and decided; and that this new compilation, as ſoon as it was approved of by the Lutheran princes and conſiſtories, ſhould be clothed with eccleſiaſtical authority, and added to the *ſymbolical* [p] our ſtandard-books of the Lutheran church. JAMES ANDREÆ, profeſſor at *Tubingen*, whoſe theological abilities had procured him the moſt eminent and ſhining reputation, had been employed ſo early as the year 1569, in this critical and difficult undertaking, by the ſpecial command of the dukes of *Wittemberg* and *Brunſwick*. The elector of *Saxony* [q], with ſeveral perſons of diſtinction, embarked with theſe two princes in the project they had formed; ſo that ANDREÆ, under the ſhade of ſuch a powerful protection and patronage, exerted all his zeal, travelled through different parts of *Germany*, negociated alternately with courts and ſynods, and took all the meaſures which prudence could ſuggeſt, in order to render the *Form*, that he was compoſing, univerſally acceptable.

---

[o] CASP. SAGITTARII *Introductio ad Hiſt. Eccleſiaſticam*, part II. p. 1542.

☞ [p] The Lutherans call *ſymbolical* (from a Greek word that ſignifies *collection* or *compilation*) the books which contain their articles of faith and rules of diſcipline.

[q] AUGUSTUS.

The Saxon Crypto-Calviniſts, or, ſecret favourers of Calviniſm.

XXXVIII. The perſons embarked in this new and critical deſign, were perſuaded that no time ought to be loſt in bringing it into execution, when they perceived the imprudence and temerity of the diſciples of MELANCTHON, and the changes they were attempting to introduce into the doctrine of the church. For his ſon-in-law PEUCER [r], who was a phyſician and profeſſor of natural philoſophy at *Wittemberg*, together with the divines of *Wittemberg* and *Leipſick*, encouraged by the approbation, and relying on the credit, of CRACOVIUS chancellor of *Dreſden*, and of ſeveral eccleſiaſtics and perſons of diſtinction at the Saxon court, aimed at nothing leſs than aboliſhing the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the euchariſt and the perſon of CHRIST, with a deſign to ſubſtitute the ſentiments of CALVIN in its place. This new

---

☞ [r] This PEUCER, whom Dr. MOSHEIM mentions without any mark of diſtinction, was one of the wiſeſt, moſt amiable, and moſt learned men that adorned the annals of German literature during this century, as the well-known hiſtory of his life, and the conſiderable number of his medical, mathematical, moral, and theological writings, abundantly teſtify. Nor was he more remarkable for his *merit*, than for his *ſufferings*. After his genius and virtues had rendered him the favourite of the elector of *Saxony*, and placed him at the head of the univerſity of *Wittemberg*, he felt, in a terrible manner, the effects of the bigotry and barbarity of the rigid Lutherans, who, on account of his denying the *corporal preſence* of CHRIST in the euchariſt, united, with ſucceſs, their efforts to deprive him of the favour of his ſovereign, and procured his impriſonment. His confinement, which laſted ten years, was accompanied with all poſſible circumſtances of ſeverity. See MELCHIOR. ADAM, *Vit. Medicor. Germanor.*

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART II.

reformation was attempted in *Saxony* in the year 1570, and a great variety of clandeſtine arts and ſtratagems were employed in order to bring it to a happy and ſucceſsful iſſue. What the ſentiments of MELANCTHON concerning the euchariſt were, towards the concluſion of his days, appears to be extremely doubtful. It is however certain, that he had a ſtrong inclination to form a coalition between the Saxons and Calviniſts, though he was prevented, by the irreſolution and timidity of his natural character, from attempting openly this much deſired union. PEUCER, and the other diſciples of MELANCTHON already mentioned, made a public profeſſion of the doctrine of CALVIN; and though they had much more ſpirit and courage than their ſoft and yielding maſter, yet they wanted *his* circumſpection and prudence, which were not leſs neceſſary to the accompliſhment of their deſigns. Accordingly, in the year 1571, they publiſhed in the German language a work, entitled, *Stereoma* [*s*], and other writings, in which they openly declared their diſſent from the doctrine of LUTHER concerning the *Euchariſt* and the *Perſon of* CHRIST [*t*]; and that

---

☞ [*s*] A term which ſignifies *foundation*.

☞ [*t*] The learned hiſtorian ſeems to deviate here from his uſual accuracy. The authors of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*, did not declare their diſſent from the doctrine of LUTHER, but from the extravagant inventions of ſome of his ſucceſſors. This great man, in his controverſy with ZUINGLE, had, indeed, thrown out ſome unguarded expreſſions, that ſeemed to imply a belief of the *omnipreſence* of the body of CHRIST; but he became ſenſible, afterwards, that this opinion was attended with great difficulties, and particularly that it ought not to be made uſe of as a *proof* of CHRIST's *corporal preſence* in the euchariſt *. But this abſurd hypotheſis was renewed, after the death of LUTHER, by TINMAN and WESTPHAL, and was dreſſed up, in a ſtill more ſpecious and plauſible form,

* See LUTHERI opp. tom. viii. p. 375. *Edit. Jenenſ.*

that they might execute their purpoſes with greater facility, introduced into the ſchools a Catechiſm, compiled by PEZELIUS, which was favourable to the ſentiments of CALVIN. As this bold ſtep excited great commotions and debates in the church, AUGUSTUS held at *Dreſden*, in the year 1571, a ſolemn convocation of the Saxon divines, and of all other perſons concerned in the adminiſtration of eccleſiaſtical affairs, and commanded them to adopt *his* opinion in relation to the euchariſt [u]. The aſſembled doctors complied with this order in appearance; but their

---

form, by BRENTIUS, CHEMNITZ, and ANDREÆ, who maintained, *the communication of the properties of* CHRIST's *divinity to his human nature*, in the manner that it was afterwards adopted by the Lutheran church. This ſtrange ſyſtem gave occaſion to the book, entitled *Stereoma*, in which the doctrine of LUTHER was reſpected, and the inventions alone of his ſucceſſors renounced, and in which the authors declared plainly, that they did not adopt the ſentiments of ZUINGLE or CALVIN; nay, that they admitted the real and ſubſtantial preſence of CHRIST's body and blood in the euchariſt.

☞ [u] In this paſſage, compared with what follows, Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems to maintain, that the *opinion* of AUGUSTUS, which he impoſed upon the aſſembled divines, was in favour of the adverſaries of MELANCTHON, and in direct oppoſition to the authors of the *Stereoma*. But here he has committed a palpable overſight. The convocation of *Dreſden*, in the year 1571, inſtead of approving or maintaining the doctrine of the rigid Lutherans, drew up, on the contrary, a *form of agreement (formula conſenſus)*, in which the *omnipreſence* or *ubiquity* of CHRIST's body was denied, and which was, indeed, an abridgment of the book, entitled, *Stereoma*. So that the tranſactions at *Dreſden* were entirely favourable to the moderate Lutherans, who embraced openly and ſincerely (and not by a *feigned* conſent *(ſubdole)* as our hiſtorian remarks) the ſentiment of the elector AUGUSTUS, who at that time patronized the diſciples of MELANCTHON. This prince, it is true, ſeduced by the crafty and artful inſinuations of the *Ubiquitarians*, or rigid Lutherans, who made him believe that the ancient doctrines of the church were in danger, changed ſides ſoon after, and was puſhed on to the moſt violent and perſecuting meaſures, of which the convocation of *Torgaw* was the firſt ſtep, and the *Form of Concord* the unhappy iſſue.

compliance was feigned [*w*]; for, on their return to the places of their abode, they reſumed their original deſign, purſued it with aſſiduity and zeal, and by their writings, as alſo by their public and private inſtructions, endeavoured to aboliſh the ancient doctrine of the Saxons, relating to the preſence of CHRIST's body in that holy ſacrament. The elector, informed of theſe proceedings, convened anew the Saxon doctors, and held, in the year 1574, the famous convocation of *Torgaw* [*x*], where, after a ſtrict enquiry into the doctrines of thoſe who, from their ſecret attachment to the ſentiments of the Swiſs divines, were called *Crypto-Calviniſts* [*y*], he committed ſome of them to priſon, ſent others into baniſhment, and engaged a certain number by the force of the ſecular arm to change their ſentiments. PEUCER, who had been principally concerned in moderating the rigour of ſome of LUTHER's doctrines, felt, in a more eſpecial manner, the dreadful effects of the elector's ſeverity. For he was confined to a hard priſon, where he lay in the moſt affecting circumſtances of diſtreſs until the year 1585, when, having obtained his liberty, through the interceſſion of the prince of *Anhalt*, who had given his daughter in marriage to AUGUSTUS, he

---

☞ [*w*] The *compliance* was ſincere, but the order was very different from that mentioned by our author; as appears from the preceding note.

☞ [*x*] It is to be obſerved, that there were but *fifteen* of the Saxon doctors convened at *Torgaw* by the ſummons of the elector; a ſmall number this, to give law to the Lutheran church. For an account of the declaration drawn up by this aſſembly, on the points relating to the *preſence of* CHRIST's body in the euchariſt, the *omnipreſence of that body*, and the *oral manducation of the fleſh and blood* of the divine Saviour; ſee HOSPINIANI *Concordia Diſcors*, p. 39.

☞ [*y*] *i. e.* Hidden or diſguiſed Calviniſts.

retired to *Zerbſt*, where he ended his days in peace [z].

The Form of Concord.

XXXIX. The ſchemes of the *Crypto-Calviniſts*, or ſecret abettors of Calviniſm, being thus diſconcerted, the elector of *Saxony*, and the other princes who had entered into his views, redoubled their zeal and diligence in promoting the *Form of Concord* that has been already mentioned. Accordingly, various conferences were held preparatory to this important undertaking; and, in the year 1576, while the Saxon divines were convened at *Torgaw* by the order of AUGUSTUS, a treatiſe was compoſed by JAMES ANDREÆ, with a deſign to heal the diviſions of the Lutheran church, and as a preſervative againſt the opinions of the *Reformed* doctors [a]. This production, which received the denomination of the *Book of Torgaw*, from the place where it was compoſed, having been carefully examined, reviewed, and corrected, by the greateſt part of the Lutheran doctors in *Germany*, the matter was again propoſed to the deliberations of a ſelect number of divines, who met at *Berg*, a Benedictine monaſtery in the neighbourhood of *Magdeburg* [b]. Here all things relating to the intended

---

☞ [z] See SCHLUSSELBURGII *Theologia Calviniſtica*, lib. ii. p. 207. lib. iii. *Præf.* & p. 1—22. 52—57. 69. lib. iv. p. 246.—HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. i—viii.—ARNOLDI *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. xvi. cap. xxxii. p. 389—395.—LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria motuum inter Lutheranos et Reformat.* part II. p. 176. part III. p. 1.—All theſe are writers favourable to the rigid Lutherans; ſee therefore, on the other ſide, CASP. PEUCERI *Hiſtoria Carcerum et Liberationis Divinæ*, which was publiſhed in 8vo. at *Zurich*, in the year 1605, by PEZELIUS.

☞ [a] The term *Reformed* was uſed to diſtinguiſh the *other Proteſtants* of various denominations from the *Lutherans*; and it is equally applied to the friends of epiſcopacy and preſbytery. See the following chapter.

☞ [b] The book that was compoſed by ANDREÆ and his aſſociates at *Torgaw*, was ſent, by the elector of *Saxony*, to almoſt all the Lutheran princes, with a view of its being examined, approved, and received by them. It was, however, rejected intended project were accurately weighed, the opinions of the aſſembled doctors carefully diſcuſſed, and the reſult of all was the famous *Form of Concord*, which has made ſo much noiſe in the world. The perſons who aſſiſted ANDREÆ in the compoſition of this celebrated work, or at leaſt in the laſt peruſal of it at *Berg*, were MARTIN CHEMNITZ, NICOLAS SELNECCER, ANDREW MUSCULUS, CHRISTOPHER CORNERUS, and DAVID CHYTRÆUS [c]. This new confeſſion of the Lutheran faith was adopted firſt by the Saxons, in conſequence of the ſtrict order of AUGUSTUS; and their example was afterwards followed by the greateſt part of the Lutheran churches, by ſome ſooner, by others later [d]. The authority of this confeſſion,

---

rejected by ſeveral princes, and cenſured and refuted by ſeveral doctors. Theſe cenſures engaged the compilers to review and correct it; and it was from this book, thus changed and new modelled, that the *Form of Concord*, publiſhed at *Berg*, was entirely drawn.

☞ [c] The *Form of Concord*, compoſed at *Torgaw*, and reviewed at *Berg*, conſiſts of *two Parts*. In the *firſt* is contained a ſyſtem of doctrine drawn up according to the fancy of the *ſix doctors* here mentioned. In the *ſecond* is exhibited one of the ſtrongeſt inſtances of that perſecuting and tyrannical ſpirit, which the proteſtants complained of in the church of *Rome*, even a formal CONDEMNATION of all thoſe who differed from theſe *ſix doctors*, particularly in their ſtrange opinions concerning the *majeſty* and *omnipreſence* of CHRIST's body, and the *real manducation* of his fleſh and blood in the euchariſt. This *condemnation* branded with the denomination of heretics, and excluded from the communion of the church, all Chriſtians, of all nations, who refuſed to ſubſcribe theſe doctrines. More particularly, in *Germany*, the terrors of the ſword were ſolicited againſt theſe pretended heretics, as may be ſeen in the famous Teſtament of BRENTIUS. For a full account of the *Confeſſion* of *Torgaw* and *Berg*, ſee HOSPINIAN's *Concordia Diſcors*; where the reader will find large extracts out of this confeſſion, with an ample account of the cenſures it underwent, the oppoſition that was made to it, and the arguments that were uſed by its learned adverſaries.

[d] A liſt of the writers who have treated concerning the *Form of Concord*, may be found in Jo. GEORG. WALCHII *Introduct.*

confeſſion, as is ſufficiently known, was employed for the two following purpoſes, *firſt*, to terminate the controverſies, which divided the Lutheran church, more eſpecially after the death of its founder; and *ſecondly*, to preſerve that church againſt the opinions of the *Reformed*, in relation to the euchariſt.

The Form of Concord produces much diſturbance,—

is oppoſed by the *Reformed* or Calviniſts,

XL. It ſo fell out, however, that this very *Form*, which was deſigned to reſtore peace and concord in the church, and had actually produced this effect in ſeveral places, became nevertheleſs a ſource of new tumults, and furniſhed matter for the moſt violent diſſentions and conteſts. It immediately met with a warm oppoſition from the *Reformed*, and alſo from all thoſe who were either ſecretly attached to their doctrine, or who, at leaſt, were deſirous of living in concord and communion with them, from a laudable zeal for the common intereſts of the proteſtant cauſe. Nor was their oppoſition at all unaccountable, ſince they plainly perceived, that this *Form* removed all the flattering hopes they had entertained, of ſeeing the diviſions that reigned among the friends of religious liberty happily healed, and entirely excluded the *Reformed* from the communion of the Lutheran church. Hence they were filled with indignation againſt the authors of this new *Con-*

---

troduct. in Libros Symbolicos, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 707. & KOECHERI *Biblioth. Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 188. There are alſo ſeveral *Documents* in MSS. relative to this famous confeſſion, of which there is an account in the German work, entitled, *Unſchuld Nachricht.* A. 1753, p. 322.—The principal writers who have given the hiſtory of the *Form of Concord*, and the tranſactions relating to it, are HOSPINIAN, an eminent divine of *Zurich*, in his *Concordia Diſcors*; and LEON. HUTTER, in his *Concordia Concors*. Theſe two hiſtorians have written on oppoſite ſides; and whoever will be at the pains of comparing their accounts with attention and impartiality, will eaſily perceive where the truth lies, and receive ſatisfactory information with reſpect to the true ſtate of theſe controverſies, and the motives that animated the contending parties.

feſſion of Faith, and expoſed their uncharitable proceedings in writings full of ſpirit and vehemence. The Swiſs doctors, with HOSPINIAN at their head, the Belgic divines [e], thoſe of the Palatinate [f], together with the principalities of *Anhalt* and *Bade,* declared war againſt the *Form of Concord.* And accordingly from this period the Lutheran, and more eſpecially the Saxon doctors, were charged with the diſagreeable taſk of defending this new Creed and its compilers, in many laborious productions [g].

and even by the Lutherans themſelves.

XLI. Nor were the followers of ZUINGLE and CALVIN the only oppoſers of this *Form of Concord;* it found adverſaries, even in the very boſom of Lutheraniſm, and ſeveral of the moſt eminent churches of that communion rejected it with ſuch firmneſs and reſolution, that no arguments nor entreaties could engage them to admit it as a rule of faith, or even as a mean of inſtruction. It was rejected by the churches of *Heſſia, Pomerania, Nuremberg, Holſtein, Sileſia, Denmark, Brunſwick,* and others [h]. But though they all united in oppoſing it, their oppoſition was nevertheleſs founded on different reaſons, nor did they all act in this affair from the ſame motives and the ſame principles. A warm and affectionate veneration for the memory of MELANCTHON was, with ſome, the only, or at leaſt the predominant, motive that induced them to declare againſt the *Form* in queſtion; they could not behold, without the utmoſt abhorrence, a production in which the ſentiments of this great and excellent man were ſo rudely treated. In this claſs we may rank the Lutherans of *Holſtein*. Others were not only animated in their oppoſition by a regard for MELANCTHON, but alſo by a perſuaſion, that the opinions, condemned in the new Creed, were more conformable to truth, than thoſe that were ſubſtituted in their place. A ſecret attachment to the ſentiments of the Helvetic doctors prevented ſome from approving of the *Form* under conſideration; the hopes of uniting the *Reformed* and *Lutheran* churches engaged many to declare againſt it; and a conſiderable number refuſed their aſſent to it from an apprehenſion, whether real or pretended, that adding a new *Creed* to the ancient confeſſions of faith would be really a ſource of diſturbance and diſcord in the Lutheran church.

---

[e] See PETRII VILERII *Epiſtola Apologetica Reformatarum in Belgio Eccleſiarum ad et contra Auctores Libri Bergenſis dicti "Concordiæ."*—This work was publiſhed a ſecond time with the Annotations of LUD. GERHARD à RENESSE, by the learned Dr. GERDES of *Groningen,* in his *Scrinium Antiquarium* ſeu *Miſcellan. Groningenſ. Nov.* tom. i. p. 121. Add to theſe the *Unſchuld. Nachricht.* A. 1747, p. 957.

[f] JOHN CASIMIR, Prince Palatine, convoked an aſſembly of the *Reformed Divines* at *Francfort,* in the year 1577, in order to annul and reject this *Form of Concord.* See HEN. ALTINGII *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Palatin.* § clxxix. p. 143.

[g] See JO. GEORG. WALCHII *Introd. in Libros Symbolicos Lutheranor.* lib. i. cap. vii. p. 734.

[h] For an account of the ill ſucceſs the *Form of Concord* met with in the dutchy of *Holſtein,* ſee the German work entitled, *Die Daniſche Bibliothec.* vol. iv. p. 212. vol. v. p. 355. vol. viii. p. 333—461. vol. ix. p. 1.—MUHLII *Diſſert. Hiſtor. Theol. Diſſ.* I. *de Reformat. Holſat.* p. 108.—ARN. GREVII *Memoria* PAULI ab EITZEN. The tranſactions in *Denmark* in relation

---

relation to this *Form*, and the particular reaſons for which it was rejected there, may be ſeen in the *Daniſh Library* above quoted, vol. iv. p. 222—282. and alſo in PONTOPPIDAN's *Annal. Eccleſ. Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 456. This latter author evidently proves (p. 476.) a fact, which HERMAN ab ELSWICH, and other authors, have endeavoured to repreſent as dubious, *viz.* that FREDERICK II. king of *Denmark*, as ſoon as he received a copy of the *Form* in queſtion, threw it into the fire, and ſaw it conſumed before his eyes.—The oppoſition that was made by the Heſſians to the ſame *Form*, may be ſeen in TIELEMANNI *Vitæ Theologor. Marpurgenſ.* p. 99.—*Daniſchen Bibliothec.* vol. vii. p. 273—364. tom. ix. p. 1—87.—The ill fate of this famous Confeſſion, in the principalities of *Lignitz* and *Brieg*, is amply related in the German work, entitled, *Unſchuld. Nachricht.* A. 1745, p. 173.

It would be endleſs to enumerate the different reaſons alleged by the different individuals or communities, who declared their diſſent from the *Form of Concord.*

The conduct of Julius, duke of *Brunſwick*, in this matter.

XLII. This *Form* was patronized in a more eſpecial manner by JULIUS, duke of *Brunſwick*, to whom, in a great meaſure, it owed its exiſtence, who had employed both his authority and munificence in order to encourage thoſe who had undertaken to compoſe it, and had commanded all the eccleſiaſtics, within his dominions, to receive and ſubſcribe it as a rule of faith. But ſcarcely was it publiſhed, when the zealous prince changed his mind, ſuffered the *Form* to be publicly oppoſed by HESHUSIUS, and other divines of his univerſity of *Helmſtadt*, and to be excluded from the number of the Creeds and confeſſions that were received by his ſubjects. The reaſons alleged by the Lutherans of *Brunſwick*, in behalf of this ſtep, were, 1*ſt*, That the *Form of Concord*, when printed, differed in ſeveral places from the manuſcript copy to which they had given their approbation: 2*dly*, That the doctrine relating to the *freedom* of the *human will* was expreſſed in it without a ſufficient degree of accuracy and preciſion, and was alſo inculcated in the harſh and improper terms that LUTHER had employed in treating that ſubject: 3*dly*, That the *ubiquity*, or univerſal and *indefinite preſence* of CHRIST's human nature, was therein poſitively maintained, notwithſtanding that the Lutheran church had never adopted any ſuch doctrine. Beſides theſe reaſons for rejecting the *Form of Concord*, which were publicly avowed, others perhaps of a ſecret nature contributed to the remarkable change, which was viſible in the ſentiments and proceedings of the duke of *Brunſwick*. Various methods and negociations were employed to remove the diſlike which this prince, and the divines that lived in his territories, had conceived againſt the Creed of *Berg*. Particularly in the year 1583, a convocation of divines from *Saxony*, *Brandenburg*, *Brunſwick*, and the Palatinate, was held at *Quedlinburg* for this purpoſe. But JULIUS perſiſted ſteadfaſtly in his oppoſition, and propoſed that the *Form of Concord* ſhould be examined, and its authority diſcuſſed by a general aſſembly or ſynod of the Lutheran church [*i*].

The Crypto-Calviniſts make new attempts to ſpread their doctrine

XLIII. This *Form* was not only oppoſed from abroad, but had likewiſe adverſaries in the very country which gave it birth. For even in *Saxony* many, who had been obliged to ſubſcribe it, beheld it with averſion, in conſequence of their attachment to the doctrine of MELANCTHON. During the life of AUGUSTUS, they were forced to ſuppreſs their ſentiments; but as ſoon as he had paid the laſt tribute to nature, and was ſucceeded by CHRISTIAN I., the moderate Lutherans and the ſecret Calviniſts reſumed their courage. The new elector had been accuſtomed, from his tender years, to the moderate ſentiments of MELANCTHON, and is alſo ſaid to have diſcovered a propenſity to the doctrine of the Helvetic church. Under his government, therefore, a fair opportunity was offered to the perſons abovementioned, of declaring their ſentiments and executing their deſigns. Nor was this opportunity neglected. The attempts to aboliſh the *Form of Concord*, that had in time paſt proved unſucceſsful, ſeemed again to be renewed, and that with a deſign to open a door for the entrance of Calviniſm into *Saxony*. The perſons who had embarked in this deſign, were greatly encouraged by the protection they received from ſeveral noblemen of the firſt rank at the Saxon court, and, particularly, from CRELLIUS, the firſt miniſter of CHRISTIAN. Under the auſpicious influence of ſuch patrons it was natural to expect ſucceſs; yet they conducted their affairs with circumſpection and prudence. Certain laws were previouſly enacted, in order to prepare the minds of the people for the intended revolution in the doctrine of the church; and ſome time after [*k*] the form of *exorciſm* was omitted in the adminiſtration of baptiſm [*l*]. Theſe meaſures were followed by others ſtill more alarming to the rigid Lutherans; for not only a new German Catechiſm, favourable to the purpoſe of the ſecret Calviniſts, was induſtriouſly diſtributed among the people, but alſo a new edition of the Bible in the ſame language, enriched with the obſervations of HENRY SALMUTH, which were artfully accommodated to this purpoſe, was, in the year 1591, publiſhed at *Dreſden*. The conſequences of theſe vigorous meaſures were violent tumults and ſeditions among the people, which the magiſtrates endeavoured to ſuppreſs, by puniſhing with ſeverity ſuch of the clergy as diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their oppoſition to the views of the court. But the whole plan of this religious revolution was, all of a ſudden, overturned by the unexpected death of CHRISTIAN, which happened in the year 1591. Then the face of affairs changed again, and aſſumed its former aſpect. The doctors, who had been principally concerned in the execution of this unſucceſsful project, were committed to priſon, or ſent into baniſhment, after the death of the elector; and its chief encourager and patron CRELLIUS ſuffered death in the year 1601, as the fruit of his temerity [*m*].

[*i*] See LEON. HUTTERI *Concordia Concors*, cap. xlv. p. 1051.—PHIL. JUL. RICHTMEYERI *Braunſchweig Kirchen Hiſtorie*, part III. cap. viii. p. 483.—See alſo the authors mentioned by CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFIUS, in his *Acta et Scripta Eccleſiæ Wurtemberg*. p. 62. & *Hiſtor. Literar. Theologiæ*, part II. p. 423.—For an account of the Convocation of *Quedlinburg*, and the *Acts* that paſſed in that aſſembly, ſee the German work, entitled, *Daniſche Bibliothec*. part VIII. p. 595.

[*k*] In the year 1591.

☞ [*l*] The cuſtom of *exorciſing*, or caſting out *evil ſpirits*, was uſed in the fourth century at the admiſſion of *Catechumens*, and was afterwards abſurdly applied in the baptiſm of infants. This application of it was retained by the greateſt part of the Lutheran churches. It was indeed aboliſhed by the elector CHRISTIAN I., but was reſtored after his death; and the oppoſition that had been made to it by CRELLIUS was the chief reaſon of his unhappy end. See JUSTI. H. BOEHMERI *Jus Eccleſiaſt. Proteſtant.* tom. iii. p. 843. *Ed. Secund. Halæ* 1727. —As alſo a German work of MELCHIOR KRAFT, entitled, *Geſchichte des Exorciſmi*, p. 401.

The diſpute ſet on foot by Huber.

XLIV. Towards the concluſion of this century, a new controverſy was imprudently ſet on foot at *Wittemberg*, by SAMUEL HUBER, a native of *Switzerland*, and profeſſor of divinity in that univerſity. The Calviniſtical doctrine of abſolute predeſtination and unconditional decrees was extremely offenſive to this adventurous doctor, and even excited his warmeſt indignation. Accordingly, he affirmed, and taught publicly, that all mankind were elected from eternity by the Supreme Being to everlaſting ſalvation, and accuſed his colleagues in particular, and the Lutheran divines in general, of a propenſity to the doctrine of CALVIN, on account of their aſſerting, that the divine election was confined to thoſe, whoſe *faith*, *foreſeen* by an omniſcient God, rendered them the proper objects of his redeeming mercy. The opinion of HUBER, as is now acknowledged by many learned men, differed more in *words* than in *reality*, from the doctrine of the Lutheran church; for he did no more than explain in a new method, and with a different turn of phraſe, what that church had always taught concerning the unlimited extent of the love of God, as embracing the whole human race, and excluding none by an *abſolute* decree from everlaſting ſalvation. However, as a diſagreeable experience and repeated examples had abundantly ſhewn, that new methods of explaining or proving even received doctrines were as much adapted to excite diviſions and conteſts, as the introduction of new errors, HUBER was exhorted to adhere to the ancient method of propoſing the doctrine of *Election*, and inſtead of his own peculiar forms of expreſſion, to make uſe of thoſe that were received and authoriſed by the church. This compliance, nevertheleſs, he refuſed to ſubmit to, alleging, that it was contrary to the dictates of his conſcience; while his patrons and diſciples, in many places, gave ſeveral indications of a turbulent and ſeditious zeal for his cauſe. Theſe conſiderations engaged the magiſtrates of *Wittemberg* to depoſe him from his office, and to ſend him into baniſhment [*n*].

[*m*] See the German work of GODF. ARNOLD, entitled, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, part II. book XVI. cap. xxxii. p. 863. As alſo the authors mentioned by HERM. ASCAN. ENGELKEN, in his *Diſſertat. de Nic. Crellio, ejuſque Supplicio, Roſtochii*, 1724, *edit*.

The judgment that ought to be formed concerning all theſe controverſies.

XLV. The controverſies, of which a ſuccinct account has now been given, and others of inferior moment, which it is needleſs to mention, were highly detrimental to the true intereſts of the Lutheran church, as is abundantly known by all who are acquainted with the hiſtory of this century. It muſt alſo be acknowledged, that the manner of conducting and deciding theſe debates, the ſpirit of the diſputants, and the proceedings of the judges, if we form our eſtimate of them by the ſentiments that prevail among the wiſer ſort of men in modern times, muſt be conſidered as inconſiſtent with equity, moderation, and charity. It betrays, nevertheleſs, a want both of candour and juſtice to inveigh indiſcriminately againſt the authors of theſe misfortunes, and to repreſent them as totally deſtitute of rational ſentiments and virtuous principles. And it is yet more unjuſt to throw the whole blame upon the triumphant party, while the ſuffering ſide are all fondly repreſented as men of unblemiſhed virtue, and worthy of a better fate. It ought not certainly to be a matter of ſurpriſe, that perſons long accuſtomed to a ſtate of darkneſs, and ſuddenly tranſported from thence into the blaze of day, did not, at firſt, behold the objects that were preſented to their view with that diſtinctneſs and preciſion that are natural to thoſe who have long enjoyed the light. And ſuch, really, was the caſe of the firſt proteſtant doctors, who were delivered from the gloom of papal ſuperſtition and tyranny. Beſides, there was ſomething groſs and indelicate in the reigning ſpirit of this age, which made the people not only tolerate, but even applaud, many things relating both to the conduct of life and the management of controverſy, which the more poliſhed manners of modern times cannot reliſh, and which, indeed, are by no means worthy of imitation. As to the particular motives or intentions that ruled each individual in this troubled ſcene of controverſy, whether they acted from the ſuggeſtions of malice and reſentment, or from an upright and ſincere attachment to what they looked upon to be the truth, or how far theſe two ſprings of action were jointly concerned in their conduct, all this muſt be left to the deciſion of Him alone, whoſe privilege it is to ſearch the heart, and to diſcern its moſt hidden intentions, and its moſt ſecret motives.

[*n*] For an account of the writers that appeared in this controverſy, ſee CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Introductio in Hiſtor. Liter. Theologiæ*, part II. lib. iii. p. 431.

The principal doctors and writers of this century.

XLVI. The Lutheran church furniſhed, during this century, a long liſt of conſiderable doctors, who illuſtrated, in their writings, the various branches of theological ſcience. After LUTHER and MELANCTHON, who ſtand foremoſt in this liſt, on account of their ſuperior genius and erudition, we may ſelect the following writers, as the moſt eminent, and as perſons whoſe names are worthy to be preſerved in the annals of literature; *viz.* WELLER, CHEMNITZ, BRENTIUS, FLACIUS, REGIUS, MAJOR, AMSDORF, SARCERIUS, MATHESIUS, WIGANDUS, LAMBERTUS, ANDREÆ, CHYTRÆUS, SALNECCER, BUCER, FAGIUS, CRUCIGER, STRIGELIUS, SPANGENBERG, JUDEX, HESHUSIUS, WESTPHAL, ÆPINUS, OSIANDER, and others [o].

CHAP. II.

The HISTORY *of the* Reformed [p] CHURCH.

The conſtitution of the Reformed church,

I. THE nature and conſtitution of the *Reformed Church*, which was formerly denominated by its adverſaries after its founders

---

[o] For an ample account of theſe Lutheran doctors, ſee MELCHIOR. ADAMI *Vitæ Theologorum*, and LOUIS ELIS DUPIN *Bibliotheque des Auteurs ſeparés de la Communion de l'Egliſe Romaine au* XVII *Siecle*. The lives of ſeveral of theſe divines have been alſo ſeparately compoſed by different authors of the preſent times; as for example, that of WELLER by LÆMELIUS, that of FLACIUS by RITTER, thoſe of HESHUSIUS and SPANGENBERG by LEUCKFELDT, that of FAGIUS by FEVERLIN, that of CHYTRÆUS by SCHUTZ, that of BUCER by VERPORTENIUS, thoſe of WESTPHAL and ÆPINUS by ARN. GREVIUS, &c.

☞ [p] It has already been obſerved that the denomination of REFORMED was given to thoſe proteſtant churches which did not embrace the doctrine and diſcipline of LUTHER. The title was firſt aſſumed by the French proteſtants, and afterwards became the common denomination of all the Calviniſtical churches on the continent. I ſay, on the continent; ſince in *England* the term *Reformed* is generally uſed as ſtanding in oppoſition to popery alone. Be that as it may, this part of Dr. MOSHEIM's work would have been perhaps, with more propriety, entitled, *The Hiſtory of the Reformed* CHURCHES, than *The Hiſtory of the Reformed* CHURCH. This will appear ſtill more evident from the following Note.

ZUINGLE and CALVIN, is entirely different from that of all other eccleſiaſtical communities. Every other Chriſtian church hath ſome common centre of union, and its members are connected together by ſome common bond of doctrine and diſcipline. But this is far from being the caſe of the *Reformed* church [q], whoſe ſeveral branches are neither

---

☞ [q] This and the following obſervations are deſigned to give the *Lutheran* church an air of *unity*, which is not to be found in the *Reformed*. But there is a real fallacy in this ſpecious repreſentation of things. The *Reformed* church, when conſidered in the true extent of the term *Reformed*, comprehends all thoſe religious communities that ſeparated themſelves from the church of *Rome*; and, in this ſenſe, includes the Lutheran church, as well as the others. And even when this epithet is uſed in oppoſition to the community founded by LUTHER, it repreſents, not a ſingle church, as the *Epiſcopal*, *Preſbyterian*, or *Independent*, but rather a collection of churches; which, though they be *inviſibly* united by a belief and profeſſion of the *fundamental* doctrines of Chriſtianity, yet frequent *ſeparate* places of worſhip, and have, each, a *viſible* centre of *external* union peculiar to themſelves, which is formed by certain *peculiarities* in their reſpective rules of public worſhip and eccleſiaſtical government. * An attentive examination of the diſcipline, polity, and worſhip of the churches of *England*, *Scotland*, *Holland*, and *Switzerland*, will ſet this matter in the cleareſt light. The firſt of theſe churches, being governed by *biſhops*, and not admitting of the validity of *preſbyterian ordination*, differs from the other three, more than any of theſe differ from each other. There are, however, peculiarities of government and worſhip, that diſtinguiſh the church of *Holland* from that of *Scotland*. The inſtitution of deacons, the uſe of forms for the celebration of the ſacraments, an ordinary form of prayer, the obſervation of the feſtivals of Chriſtmas, Eaſter, Aſcenſion-day, and Whitſuntide, are eſtabliſhed in the Dutch church; and it is well known, that the church of *Scotland* differs from it extremely in theſe reſpects. —But, after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount? are not ſome of the Lutheran churches governed by biſhops, while others are ruled by elders? It ſhall moreover be ſhewn, in its proper place, that, even in point of doctrine, the Lutheran churches are not ſo very remarkable for their uniformity.

* See *The general ſketch of the ſtate of the church in the eighteenth century*, in the ſixth volume, paragraph XXI. and note [y].

united by the ſame ſyſtem of doctrine, nor by the ſame mode of worſhip, nor yet by the ſame form of government. It is farther to be obſerved, that this church does not require from its miniſters, either uniformity in their private ſentiments, or in their public doctrine, but permits them to explain, in different ways, ſeveral doctrines of no ſmall moment, provided that the great and fundamental principles of Chriſtianity, and the practical precepts of that divine religion, be maintained in their original purity. This great community, therefore, may be properly conſidered as an eccleſiaſtical body compoſed of ſeveral churches, that vary, more or leſs, from each other in their form and conſtitution; but which are preſerved, however, from anarchy and ſchiſms, by a general ſpirit of equity and toleration, that runs through the whole ſyſtem, and renders variety of opinion conſiſtent with fraternal union.

The cauſes that produced this ſtate of things.

II. This indeed was not the original ſtate and conſtitution of the Reformed church, but was the reſult of a certain combination of events and circumſtances, that threw it, by a ſort of neceſſity, into this ambiguous form. The doctors of *Switzerland*, from whom it derived its origin, and CALVIN, who was one of its principal founders, employed all their credit, and exerted their moſt vigorous efforts, in order to reduce all the churches, which embraced their ſentiments, under one rule of faith, and the ſame form of eccleſiaſtical government. And although they conſidered the Lutherans as their brethren, yet they ſhewed no marks of indulgence to thoſe who openly favoured the opinions of LUTHER, concerning the *Euchariſt*, the *Perſon of* CHRIST, *Predeſtination*, and other matters that were connected with theſe doctrines; nor would they permit the other proteſtant churches, that embraced their communion, to deviate from their example in this reſpect. A new ſcene, however, which was exhibited in *Britain*, contributed much to enlarge this narrow and contracted ſyſtem of church-communion. For when the violent conteſt concerning the form of eccleſiaſtical government, and the nature and number of thoſe rites and ceremonies that were proper to be admitted into the public worſhip, aroſe between the abettors of *Epiſcopacy* and the *Puritans* [r], it was judged neceſſary to extend the borders of the Reformed church, and rank in the claſs of its true members, even thoſe who departed, in ſome reſpects, from the eccleſiaſtical polity and doctrines eſtabliſhed at Geneva. This ſpirit of toleration and indulgence grew ſtill more forbearing and comprehenſive after the famous ſynod of *Dort*. For though the ſentiments and doctrines of the *Arminians* were rejected and condemned in that numerous aſſembly, yet they gained ground privately, and inſinuated themſelves into the minds of many. The church of *England*, under the reign of CHARLES I., publicly renounced the opinions of CALVIN relating to the *Divine Decrees*, and made ſeveral attempts to model its doctrine and inſtitutions after the laws, tenets, and cuſtoms, that were obſerved by the primitive Chriſtians [s]. On the other hand, ſeveral Lutheran congregations in *Germany* entertained a ſtrong propenſity to the

---

☞ [r] The *Puritans*, who inclined to the preſbyterian form of church-government, of which KNOX was one of the earlieſt abettors in *Britain*, derived this denomination, from their pretending to a *purer* method of worſhip than that which had been eſtabliſhed by EDWARD VI., and Queen ELIZABETH.

☞ [s] This aſſertion is equivocal. Many members of the church of *England*, with archbiſhop LAUD at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of ARMINIUS, both in their pulpits and in their writings. But it is not accurate to ſay that the *Church of England renounced publickly*, in that reign, the opinions of CALVIN. See this matter farther diſcuſſed, in the note [m], Cent. XVII. Sect. II. P. II. ch. II. paragraph xx.

doctrines

doctrines and diſcipline of the church of *Geneva*; though they were reſtrained from declaring themſelves fully and openly on this head, by their apprehenſions of forfeiting the privileges they derived from their adherence to the confeſſion of *Augſburg*. The French refugees alſo, who had long been accuſtomed to a moderate way of thinking in religious matters, and whoſe national turn led them to a certain freedom of inquiry, being diſperſed abroad in all parts of the proteſtant world, rendered themſelves ſo agreeable, by their wit and eloquence, that their example excited a kind of emulation in favour of religious liberty. All theſe circumſtances, accompanied with others, whoſe influence was leſs palpable, though equally real, inſtilled, by degrees, ſuch a ſpirit of lenity and forbearance into the minds of proteſtants, that at this day, all Chriſtians, if we except *Roman-catholics*, *Socinians*, *Quakers*, and *Anabaptiſts*, may claim a place among the members of the Reformed church. It is true, great reluctance was diſcovered by many againſt this comprehenſive ſcheme of church-communion; and, even in the times in which we live, the ancient and leſs charitable manner of proceeding hath ſeveral patrons, who would be glad to ſee the doctrines and inſtitutions of CALVIN univerſally adopted and rigorouſly obſerved. The number, however, of theſe rigid doctors is not very great, nor is their influence conſiderable. And it may be affirmed with truth, that, both in point of number and authority, they are much inferior to the friends of moderation, who reduce within a narrow compaſs the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity on the belief of which ſalvation depends, exerciſe forbearance and fraternal charity towards thoſe who explain certain doctrines in a manner peculiar to themſelves, and deſire to ſee the encloſure (if I may uſe that expreſſion) of the Reformed church rendered as large and comprehenſive as is poſſible [s].

The founder of the Reformed church laid by Zuingle.

III. The founder of the Reformed church was ULRICK ZUINGLE, a native of *Switzerland*, and a man of uncommon penetration and acuteneſs, accompanied with an ardent zeal for truth. This great man was for removing out of the churches, and aboliſhing in the ceremonies and appendages of public worſhip, many things which LUTHER was diſpoſed to treat with toleration and indulgence, ſuch as images, altars, wax-tapers, the form of *exorciſm*, and private confeſſion. He aimed at nothing ſo much as eſtabliſhing, in his country, a method and form of divine worſhip remarkable for its ſimplicity, and as far remote as could be from every thing that might have the ſmalleſt tendency to nouriſh a ſpirit of ſuperſtition [t]. Nor were theſe the only circumſtances in

---

[s] The annals of theology have not as yet been enriched with a full and accurate *Hiſtory of the Reformed Church*. This taſk was indeed undertaken by SCULTET, and even carried down ſo far as his own time, in his *Annales Evangelii Renovati*; but the greateſt part of this work is loſt. THEOD. HASÆUS, who propoſed to give the *Annals of the Reformed Church*, was prevented by death from fulfilling his purpoſe. The famous work of JAMES BASNAGE, publiſhed in two volumes 4to at *Rotterdam*, in the year 1725, under the title of *Hiſtoire de la Religion des Egliſes Reformées*, inſtead of giving a regular Hiſtory of the Reformed Church, is only deſigned to ſhew, that its peculiar and diſtinguiſhing doctrines are not new inventions, but were taught and embraced in the earlieſt ages of the church.—MAIMBOURG's *Hiſtoire du Calviniſme*, is remarkable for nothing, but the partiality of its author, and the wilful errors with which it abounds.

☞ [t] The deſign of ZUINGLE was certainly excellent; but in the execution of it perhaps he went too far, and conſulted rather the dictates of reaſon than the real exigencies of human nature in its preſent ſtate. The preſent union between ſoul and body, which operate *together* in the actions of moral agents, even in thoſe that appear the moſt abſtracted and refined, renders it neceſſary to conſult the *external ſenſes*, as well as the *intellectual powers*, in the inſtitution of public worſhip. Beſides, in which he differed from the Saxon reformer; for his ſentiments concerning ſeveral points of theology, and more eſpecially his opinions relating to the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, varied widely from thoſe of LUTHER. The greateſt part of theſe ſentiments and opinions were adopted in *Switzerland*, by thoſe who had joined themſelves to ZUINGLE in promoting the cauſe of the Reformation, and were by them tranſmitted to all the Helvetic churches, that threw off the yoke of *Rome*. From *Switzerland* theſe opinions were propagated among the neighbouring nations, by the miniſterial labours and the theological writings of the friends and diſciples of ZUINGLE; and thus the primitive Reformed church, that was founded by this eminent eccleſiaſtic, and whoſe extent at firſt was not very conſiderable, gathered ſtrength by degrees, and made daily new acquiſitions.

The controverſy between the Lutherans and Reformed concerning the euchariſt.

IV. The ſeparation between the Lutheran and Swiſs churches was chiefly occaſioned by the doctrine of ZUINGLE, concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper. LUTHER maintained, that the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST were *really*, though in a manner far beyond human comprehenſion, *preſent* in the euchariſt, and were exhibited together with the *bread* and *wine*. On the contrary, the Swiſs reformer looked upon the *bread* and *wine* in no other light, than as the *ſigns* and *ſymbols* of the *abſent* body and blood of CHRIST; and,

---

Beſides, between a worſhip purely and philoſophically rational, and a ſervice groſsly and palpably ſuperſtitious, there are many intermediate ſteps and circumſtances, by which a rational ſervice may be rendered more affecting and awakening, without becoming ſuperſtitious. A noble edifice, a ſolemn muſic, a well-ordered ſet of external geſtures, though they do not, in themſelves, render our prayers one whit more acceptable to the Deity, than if they were offered up without any of theſe circumſtances, produce, nevertheleſs, a good effect. They elevate the mind, they give it a compoſed and ſolemn frame, and thus contribute to the fervour of its devotion.

from the year 1524, propagated this doctrine in a public manner by his writings, after having entertained and taught it privately before that period [u]. In a little time after this [w], his example was followed by OECOLAMPADIUS, a divine of *Baſil*, and one of the moſt learned men of that century [x]. But they were both oppoſed with obſtinacy and ſpirit by LUTHER and his aſſociates, particularly thoſe of the circle of *Suabia*. In the mean time, PHILIP, landgrave of *Heſſe*, apprehending the pernicious effects that theſe debates might have upon the affairs of the *proteſtants*, which were, as yet, in that fluctuating and unſettled ſtate that marks the infancy of all great revolutions, was deſirous of putting an end to theſe differences, and appointed, for that purpoſe, a conference at *Marpurg*, between ZUINGLE, LUTHER, and other doctors of both parties [y]. This meeting, however, only covered the flame, inſtead of extinguiſhing it; and the pacific prince, ſeeing it impoſſible to bring about a definitive treaty of peace and concord between theſe jarring divines, was obliged to reſt ſatisfied with having engaged them to conſent to a truce. LUTHER and ZUINGLE came to an agreement about ſeveral points; but the principal matter in debate, even that which regarded CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt, was left undecided; each party appealing to the Fountain of wiſdom to terminate this controverſy, and expreſſing their hopes that time and impartial reflexion might diſcover and confirm the truth [z].

---

[u] ZUINGLE certainly taught this doctrine in private before the year 1524, as appears from GERDES, *Hiſtoria Renovat. Evangelii*, tom. i. *Append.* p. 228.

[w] In the year 1525.

[x] JO. CONR. FUESLINI *Centuria* I. *Epiſtol. Theolog. Reformat.* p. 31. 35. 44. 49.—☞ OECOLAMPADIUS was not leſs remarkable for his extraordinary modeſty, his charitable, forbearing, and pacific ſpirit, and his zeal for the progreſs of vital and *practical* religion, than for his profound erudition, which he ſeemed rather ſtudious to conceal than to diſplay.

☞ [y] ZUINGLE was accompanied by OECOLAMPADIUS, BUCER, and HEDION. LUTHER had with him MELANCTHON and JUSTUS JONAS from *Saxony*, together with OSIANDER, BRENTIUS, and AGRICOLA.

The progreſs of theſe diſputes ſo far down as the death of Luther.

V. The Reformed church had ſcarcely been founded in *Switzerland* by ZUINGLE, when this Chriſtian hero fell in a battle that was fought, in the year 1530, between the proteſtants of *Zurich*, and their Roman-catholic compatriots, who drew the ſword in defence of popery. It was not indeed to perform the ſanguinary office of a ſoldier that ZUINGLE was preſent at this engagement, but with a view to encourage and animate, by his counſels and exhortations, the valiant defenders of the proteſtant cauſe [a]. After his death,

---

[z] RUCHAT, *Hiſtoire de la Reformation de la Suiſſe*, vol. i. paſſim. vol. ii. livr. vi. p. 463.—HOTTINGER, *Helvetiſche Kirchen-Geſchichte*, part III. p. 27. 51. 483.—VAL. ERN. LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part I. cap. ii. iii. p. 55. cap. vi. p. 143.—FUESLIN, *Beyträge zur Schweizer Reformation*, tom. iv. p. 120.

[a] The Lutherans, who conſider this unhappy fate of ZUINGLE as a reproach upon that great man in particular, and upon the Reformed church in general, diſcover a groſs ignorance of the genius and manners of the Swiſs nation in this century. For as all the inhabitants of that country are at preſent trained to arms, and obliged to take the field when the defence of their country requires it, ſo in the time of ZUINGLE this obligation was ſo univerſal, that neither the miniſters of the goſpel, nor the profeſſors of theology, were exempted from this military ſervice. Accordingly in the ſame battle in which ZUINGLE fell, JEROME POTANUS, one of the theological doctors of *Baſil*, alſo loſt his life. See FUESLINI *Centuria* I. *Epiſtolar. Theol. Reformator.* p. 84. ☞ ERASMUS alſo ſpoke in a very unfriendly manner of the death of ZUINGLE and his friend OECOLAMPADIUS. See JORTIN's *Life of* ERASMUS, vol. i. p. 522. It is not therefore ſurpriſing to find the bigoted Sir THOMAS MORE inſulting (with the barbarity that ſuperſtition ſeldom fails to produce in a narrow and peeviſh mind) the memory of theſe two eminent Reformers, in a letter to the furious and turbulent COCHLAEUS;

of

death, ſeveral Lutheran doctors of the more moderate ſort, and particularly MARTIN BUCER, uſed their utmoſt endeavours to bring about ſome kind of reconciliation between the contending parties. For this purpoſe they exhorted the jarring theologians to concord, interpreted the points in diſpute with a prudent regard to the prejudices of both ſides, admoniſhed them of the pernicious conſequences that muſt attend the prolongation of theſe unhappy conteſts, and even went ſo far as to expreſs the reſpective ſentiments of the contending doctors in terms of conſiderable ambiguity and latitude, that thus the deſired union might be the more eaſily effected. There is no doubt, but that the intentions and deſigns of theſe zealous interceſſors were pious and upright [*b*]; but it will be difficult to decide, whether or no the means they employed were adapted to promote the end they had in view. Be that as it may, theſe pacific counſels of BUCER excited diviſions in *Switzerland*; for ſome perſevered obſtinately in the doctrine of ZUINGLE, while others adopted the explications and modifications of his doctrine that were offered by BUCER [*c*]. But theſe diviſions and commotions had not the leaſt effect on that reconciliation with LUTHER, that was earneſtly deſired by the pious and moderate

---

of which the following words ſhew the ſpirit of the writer: "Poſtrema ea fuit, quam de ZUINGLIO & OECOLAMPADIO "ſcriptam miſiſti, quorum nunciata mors mihi *Lætitiam* "*attulit.*—Sublatos e medio eſſe tam immanes *Fidei Chriſtianæ* "hoſtes, tam intentos ubique in omnem *perimendæ pietatis* "*occaſionem*, jure gaudere poſſum." JORTIN, ibid. vol. ii. p. 702. *App.* No, XVI. N.

[*b*] See ALB. MENON. VERPOORTEN, *Comment. de Mart. Bucero et ejus Sententia de Cœna Domini*, § ix. p. 23. publiſhed in 8vo at *Coburg*, in the year 1709.—LOSCHERI *Hiſtor. Motuum*, part I. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 181. & part II. lib. iii. cap. ii. p. 15.

[*c*] FUESLINI *Centur.* I. *Epiſtolar. Theolog.* p. 162. 170. 181, 182. 190, &c.

doctors on both ſides. The efforts of BUCER were more ſucceſsful out of *Switzerland*, and particularly among thoſe divines in the upper parts of *Germany*, who inclined to the ſentiments of the Helvetic church; for they retired from the communion of that church, and joined themſelves to LUTHER by a public act, which was ſent to *Wittemberg*, in the year 1536, by a ſolemn deputation appointed for that purpoſe [d]. The Swiſs divines could not be brought to ſo great a length. There was, however, ſtill ſome proſpect of effecting a reconciliation between them and the Lutherans. But this fair proſpect entirely diſappeared in the year 1544, when LUTHER publiſhed his *Confeſſion* of faith in relation to the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, which was directly oppoſite to the doctrine of ZUINGLE and his followers, on that head. The doctors of *Zurich* pleaded their cauſe publickly againſt the Saxon reformer the year following; and thus the purpoſes of the peace-makers were totally defeated [e].

The tranſactions that ſucceeded the death of Luther.

VI. The death of LUTHER, which happened in the year 1546, was an event that ſeemed adapted to calm theſe commotions, and to revive, in the breaſts of the moderate and pacific, the hopes of a reconciliation between the contending parties. For this union, between the Lutherans and Zuinglians, was ſo ardently deſired by MELANCTHON, and his followers, that this great man left no means unemployed to bring it about, and ſeemed reſolved rather to ſubmit to a dubious and forced peace, than to ſee thoſe flaming diſcords perpetuated, which reflected ſuch diſhonour on the proteſtant cauſe. On the other hand, this ſalutary work ſeemed to be facilitated by the theological ſyſtem that was adopted by JOHN CALVIN, a native of *Noyon* in *France*, who was paſtor and profeſſor of divinity at *Geneva*, and whoſe genius, learning, eloquence, and talents rendered him reſpectable even in the eyes of his enemies. This great man, whoſe particular friendſhip for MELANCTHON was an incidental circumſtance highly favourable to the intended reconciliation, propoſed an explication of the point in debate, that modified the crude hypotheſis of ZUINGLE, and made uſe of all his credit and authority among the Swiſs, and more particularly at *Zurich*, where he was held in the higheſt veneration, in order to obtain their aſſent to it [*f*]. The explication he propoſed was not, indeed, favourable to the doctrine of CHRIST's bodily preſence in the eucharift, which he perſiſted in denying; he ſuppoſed, however, that a certain *divine virtue* or *efficacy* was communicated by CHRIST with the *bread* and *wine*, to thoſe who approached this holy ſacrament with a lively faith, and with upright hearts; and to render this notion ſtill more ſatisfactory, he expreſſed it in almoſt the ſame terms which the Lutherans employed in inculcating their doctrine of CHRIST's real preſence in the euchariſt [*g*]. For the great and common error of all thoſe, who, from a deſire of peace, aſſumed the character of arbitrators in this controverſy, lay in this, that they aimed rather at a uniformity of *terms*, than of *ſentiments*; and ſeemed ſatisfied when they had engaged the contending parties to uſe the ſame *words* and phraſes, though their real difference in opinion remained the ſame, and each explained theſe ambiguous or figurative terms in a manner agreeable to their reſpective ſyſtems.

---

[d] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* cap. ii. p. 205.—RUCHAT, *Hiſtoire de la Reformat. de la Suiſſe*, tom. v. p. 535.—HOTTINGERI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Helvet.* tom. iii. lib. vi. p. 702.

[e] LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part i. lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 341.

[*f*] CHRIST. AUG. SALIG. *Hiſtoria Aug. Confeſſion.* tom. ii. lib. vii. cap. iii. p. 1075.

☞ [*g*] CALVIN went certainly too far in this matter; and, in his explication of the benefits that ariſe from a worthy commemoration of CHRIST's death in the euchariſt, he dwelt too groſly upon the *allegorical* expreſſions of ſcripture, which the papiſts had ſo egregiouſly abuſed, and talked of *really* eating *by faith the body*, and drinking the blood of CHRIST.

The concord, ſo much deſired; did not, however, ſeem to advance much. MELANCTHON, who ſtood foremoſt in the rank of thoſe who longed impatiently for it, had not courage enough to embark openly in the execution of ſuch a perilous project. Beſides, after the death of LUTHER, his enemies attacked him with redoubled fury, and gave him ſo much diſagreeable occupation, that he had neither that leiſure, nor that tranquillity of mind, that were neceſſary to prepare his meaſures properly for ſuch an arduous undertaking. A new obſtacle to the execution of this pacific project was alſo preſented, by the intemperate zeal of JOACHIM WESTPHAL, paſtor at *Hamburg*, who, in the year 1552, renewed, with greater vehemence than ever, this deplorable controverſy, which had been for ſome time ſuſpended, and who, after FLACIUS, was the moſt obſtinate defender of the opinions of LUTHER. This violent theologian attacked with that ſpirit of acrimony and vehemence, that was too remarkable in the polemic writings of LUTHER, the *act of uniformity*, by which the churches of *Geneva* and *Zurich* declared their *agreement concerning the doctrine of the euchariſt*. In the book which he publiſhed with this view [*b*], he cenſured with the utmoſt ſeverity, the variety of ſentiments concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper that was obſervable in the Reformed church, and maintained, with his uſual warmth and ob-

---

☞ [*b*] This book, which abounds with ſenſeleſs and extravagant tenets that LUTHER never ſo much as thought of, and breathes the moſt virulent ſpirit of perſecution, is entitled, *Farrago confuſanearum et inter ſe diſſidentium de S. Cœna opinionum ex Sacramentariorum Libris congeſta*.

ſtinacy, the opinion of LUTHER on that ſubject. This engaged CALVIN to enter the liſts with WESTPHAL, whom he treated with as little lenity and forbearance, as the rigid Lutheran had ſhewed towards the Helvetic churches. The conſequences of this debate were, that CALVIN and WESTPHAL had each their zealous defenders and patrons; hence the breach widened, the ſpirits were heated, and the flame of controverſy was kindled anew with ſuch violence and fury, that, to extinguiſh it entirely, ſeemed to be a taſk beyond the reach of human wiſdom or human power [i].

The controverſy concerning predeſtination.

VII. Theſe diſputes were unhappily augmented, in proceſs of time, by that famous controverſy concerning the *decrees of God*, with reſpect to the eternal condition of men, which was ſet on foot by CALVIN, and became an inexhauſtible ſource of intricate reſearches, and abſtruſe, ſubtile, and inexplicable queſtions. The moſt ancient Helvetic doctors were far from adopting the doctrine of thoſe, who repreſent the Deity as allotting, from all eternity, by an *abſolute*, *arbitrary*, and *unconditional* decree, to ſome everlaſting happineſs, and to others endleſs miſery, without any *previous* regard to the moral characters and circumſtances of either. Their ſentiments ſeemed to differ but very little from thoſe of the Pelagians; nor did they heſitate in declaring, after the example of ZUINGLE, that the kingdom of heaven was open to all who lived according to the dictates of right reaſon [k]. CALVIN had adopted a quite different ſyſtem with reſpect to the divine decrees. He maintained, that the everlaſting condition of mankind in a future world, was determined from all eternity by the *unchangeable order* of the Deity, and that this *abſolute* determination of his *will* and *good pleaſure* was the *only* ſource of happineſs or miſery to every individual. This opinion was, in a very ſhort time, propagated through all the Reformed churches, by the writings of CALVIN, and by the miniſtry of his diſciples, and in ſome places was inſerted in the national creeds and confeſſions; and thus made a public article of faith. The unhappy controverſy, which took its riſe from this doctrine, was opened at *Straſburg*, in the year 1560, by JEROME ZANCHIUS, an Italian eccleſiaſtic, who was particularly attached to the ſentiments of CALVIN; and was afterwards carried on by others with ſuch zeal and aſſiduity, that it drew, in an extraordinary manner, the attention of the public, and tended as much to exaſperate the paſſions, and foment the diſcord of the contending parties, as the diſpute about the eucharist had already done [*l*].

---

[i] LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part II. lib. iii. cap. viii. p. 83.—MOLLERI *Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. p. 642. ARN. GREVII *Memoria* JOAC. WESTPHALI, p. 62. 106.

[k] For the proof of this aſſertion, ſee DALLEI *Apologia pro duabus Eccleſiarum Gallicar. Synodis adverſus Frid. Spanheim.* part IV. p. 946.—JO. ALPHONS. TURRETINI *Epiſtol. ad Anteſtitem Cantuarienſem*, which is inſerted in the *Bibliotheque Germanic*, tom. xiii. p. 92.—SIMON, *Bibliotheque Critique*, publiſhed under the fictitious name of SAINIOR,

The diſcord is carried to the greateſt height.

VIII. The Helvetic doctors had no proſpect left of calming the troubled ſpirits, and tempering, at leaſt, the vehemence of theſe deplorable feuds, but the moderation of the Saxon divines, who were the diſciples of MELANCTHON, and who, breathing

---

tom. iii. ch. xxviii. p. 292. 298. and alſo the author of a book, entitled, *Obſervationes Gallicæ in Formul. Conſenſus Helveticum*, p. 52. The very learned Dr. GERDES, inſtead of being perſuaded by theſe teſtimonies, maintains, on the contrary, in his *Miſcellan. Groningenſ.* tom. ii. p. 476, 477. that the ſentiments of CALVIN were the ſame with thoſe of the ancient Swiſs doctors. But this excellent author may be refuted, even from his own account of the tumults that were occaſioned in *Switzerland* by the opinion that CALVIN had propagated in relation to the divine decrees.

[*l*] LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. ii. p. 27. S. c. x. p. 227.—SALIG, *Hiſtoria Auguſt. Confeſſion.* tom. i. lib. ii. cap. xiii. p. 441.

breathing the pacific ſpirit of their maſter, ſeemed, after his death, to have nothing ſo much at heart as the reſtoration of concord and union in the proteſtant church. Their deſigns, however, were not carried on with that caution and circumſpection, with that prudent foreſight, or that wiſe attention to the nature of the times, which diſtinguiſhed always the tranſactions of MELANCTHON, and which the critical nature of the cauſe they were engaged in, indiſpenſably required. And hence they had already taken a ſtep, which was adapted to render ineffectual all the remedies they could apply to the healing of the preſent diſorders. For, by diſperſing every where artful and inſiduous writings, with a deſign to ſeduce the miniſters of the church, and the ſtudious youth, into the ſentiments of the Swiſs divines, or, at leaſt, to engage them to treat theſe ſentiments with toleration and forbearance, they drew upon themſelves the indignation of their adverſaries, and ruined the pacific cauſe in which they had embarked. It was this conduct of theirs that gave occaſion to the compoſition of that famous *Form of Concord*; which condemned the ſentiments of the Reformed churches in relation to the *perſon* of CHRIST, and the *ſacrament* of the Lord's ſupper. And as this *Form* is received by the greateſt part of the Lutherans, as one of the articles of their religion; hence ariſes an inſuperable obſtacle to all ſchemes of reconciliation and concord.

What thoſe things are, that are moſt worthy of obſervation in the riſe and progreſs of the Reformed church.

IX. So much did it ſeem neceſſary to premiſe concerning the cauſes, riſe, and progreſs of the controverſy, which formed that ſeparation that ſtill ſubſiſts between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. From thence it will be proper to proceed to an account of the internal ſtate of the latter, and to the hiſtory of its progreſs and revolutions. The hiſtory of the Reformed church, during this century, comprehends two diſtinct periods. The firſt commences with the year 1519, when ZUINGLE withdrew from the communion of *Rome*, and began to form a Chriſtian church beyond the bounds of the pope's juriſdiction; and it extends to the time of CALVIN's ſettlement at *Geneva*, where he acquired the greateſt reputation and authority. The ſecond period takes in the reſt of this century.

During the firſt of theſe periods, the Helvetic church, which aſſumed the title of *Reformed*, after the example of the French proteſtants in their neighbourhood, who had choſen this denomination in order to diſtinguiſh themſelves from the Roman-catholics, was very inconſiderable in its extent, and was confined to the cantons of *Switzerland.* It was indeed augmented by the acceſſion of ſome ſmall ſtates in *Suabia* and *Alſace*, ſuch as the city of *Straſbourg*, and ſome little republics. But, in the year 1536, theſe petty ſtates changed ſides, through the ſuggeſtions and influence of BUCER, returned to the communion of the Saxon church, and thus made their peace with LUTHER. The other religious communities, which abandoned the church of *Rome*, either openly embraced the doctrine of LUTHER, or conſiſted of perſons, who were not agreed in their theological opinions, and who really ſeemed to ſtand in a kind of neutrality between the contending parties. All things being duly conſidered, it appears probable enough that the church, founded by ZUINGLE, would have remained ſtill confined to the narrow limits which bounded it at firſt, had not CALVIN ariſen, to augment its extent, authority, and luſtre. For the natural and political character of the Swiſs, which is neither bent towards the luſt of conqueſt, nor the graſping views of ambition, diſcovered itſelf in their religious tranſactions. And, as a ſpirit of contentment with what they had, prevented their aiming at an augmentation of their territory, ſo did a ſimilar ſpirit hinder them from being extremely ſolicitous about enlarging the borders of their church.

The religious points that firſt excited diviſions between the Swiſs and the Lutherans.

X. In this infant ſtate of the *Reformed* church, the only point that prevented its union with the followers of LUTHER, was the doctrine they taught with reſpect to the *ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper*. This firſt controverſy, indeed, ſoon produced a ſecond, relating to the *perſon of* JESUS CHRIST, which, nevertheleſs, concerned only a part of the Lutheran church [m]. The Lutheran divines of *Suabia*, in the courſe of their debates with thoſe of *Switzerland*, drew an argument in favour of the *real* preſence of CHRIST's body and blood in the euchariſt, from the following propoſition; that *all the* PROPERTIES *of the divine nature, and conſequently its* OMNIPRESENCE, *were communicated to the human nature of* CHRIST *by the hypoſtatic union*. The Swiſs doctors, in order to deſtroy the force of this argument, denied this *communication of the divine attributes to* CHRIST's *human nature*, and denied, more eſpecially, the *ubiquity* or *omnipreſence* of the *man* JESUS. And hence aroſe that moſt intricate and abſtruſe controverſy concerning *ubiquity* and the *communication of properties*, that produced ſo many learned and unintelligible treatiſes, ſo many ſubtile diſputes, and occaſioned that multitude of invectives and accuſations, that the contending parties threw out againſt each other with ſuch liberality and profuſion.

☞ [m] It was only a certain number of thoſe Lutherans, that were much more rigid in their doctrine than LUTHER himſelf, that believed the *Ubiquity* or *Omnipreſence* of CHRIST's perſon, conſidered as a *Man*. By this we may ſee, that the *Lutherans* have their diviſions, as well as the *Reformed*, of which ſeveral inſtances may be yet given in the courſe of this hiſtory.

It is proper to obſerve, that, at this time, the Helvetic church univerſally embraced the doctrine of ZUINGLE concerning the euchariſt. This doctrine, which differed conſiderably from that of CALVIN, amounted to the following propoſitions: "That the *bread* and *wine* were no more than a "repreſentation of the *body* and *blood* of CHRIST; "or, in other words, the *ſigns* appointed to denote the benefits that were conferred upon mankind in conſequence of the death of CHRIST: "that, therefore, Chriſtians derived no other fruit "from the participation of the Lord's ſupper, than "a mere commemoration and remembrance of "the merits of CHRIST, which, according to an "expreſſion common in the mouths of the abettors of this doctrine, was the *only thing that was* "*properly meant by the Lord's ſupper* [n]." BUCER, whoſe leading principle was the deſire of peace and concord, endeavoured to correct and modify this doctrine in ſuch a manner, as to give it a certain degree of conformity to the hypotheſis of LUTHER; but the memory of ZUINGLE was too freſh in the minds of the Swiſs to permit their accepting of theſe corrections and modifications, or to ſuffer them to depart, in any reſpect, from the doctrine of that eminent man, who had founded their church, and been the inſtrument of their deliverance from the tyranny and ſuperſtition of *Rome*.

John Calvin the principal founder of the Reformed church.

XI. In the year 1541, JOHN CALVIN, who ſurpaſſed almoſt all the doctors of this age in laborious application, conſtancy of mind, force of eloquence, and extent of genius, returned to *Geneva*, from whence the oppoſition of his enemies had obliged him to retire. On his ſettlement in that city, the affairs of the new church were committed to his direction [o], and he acquired alſo a high degree of influence in the political adminiſtration of that republic. This event changed entirely the face of affairs, and gave a new aſpect to the Reformed church. The views and projects of this great man were grand and extenſive. For he not only undertook to give ſtrength and vigour to the riſing church, by framing the wiſeſt laws and the moſt ſalutary inſtitutions for the maintenance of order and the advancement of true piety, but even propoſed to render *Geneva* the mother, the ſeminary, of all the *Reformed* churches, as *Wittemberg* was of all the *Lutheran* communities. He laid a ſcheme for ſending forth from this little republic, the ſuccours and miniſters that were to promote and propagate the proteſtant cauſe through the moſt diſtant nations, and aimed at nothing leſs than rendering the government, diſcipline, and doctrine of *Geneva* the model and rule of imitation to the Reformed churches throughout the world. The undertaking was certainly great, and worthy of the extenſive genius and capacity of this eminent man; and, great and arduous as it was, it was executed in part, nay, carried on to a very conſiderable length, by his indefatigable aſſiduity and inextinguiſhable zeal. It was with this view, that, by the fame of his learning, as well as by his epiſtolary ſolicitations and encouragements of various kinds, he engaged many perſons of rank and fortune, in *France*, *Italy*, and other countries, to leave the places of their nativity, and to ſettle at *Geneva*; while others repaired thither merely out of a curioſity to ſee a man, whoſe talents and exploits had rendered him ſo famous, and to hear the diſcourſes which he delivered in public. Another circumſtance, that contributed much to the ſucceſs of his deſigns, was the eſtabliſhment of an academy at *Geneva*, which the ſenate of that city founded at his requeſt; and in which he himſelf, with his colleague THEODORE BEZA, and other divines of eminent learning and abilities, taught the ſciences with the greateſt reputation. In effect, the luſtre which theſe great men reflected upon this infant ſeminary of learning, ſpread its fame through the diſtant nations with ſuch amazing rapidity, that all who were ambitious of a diſtinguiſhed progreſs in either ſacred or profane erudition, repaired to *Geneva*, and that *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, *Italy*, and *Germany*, ſeemed to vie with each other in the numbers of their ſtudious youth, that were inceſſantly repairing to the new academy. By theſe means, and by the miniſtry of theſe his diſciples, CALVIN enlarged conſiderably the borders of the *Reformed* church, propagated his doctrine, and gained proſelytes and patrons to his theological ſyſtem, in ſeveral countries of *Europe*. In the midſt of this glorious career he ended his days, in the year 1564; but the ſalutary inſtitutions and wiſe regulations, of which he had been the author, were both reſpected and maintained after his death. In a more eſpecial manner the academy of *Geneva* flouriſhed as much under BEZA, as it had done during the life of its founder [p].

---

[n] *Nil eſſe in Cœna, quam memoriam Chriſti.* That this was the real opinion of ZUINGLE, appears evidently from various teſtimonies, which may be ſeen in the *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. i. p. 485. 490. tom. iii. p. 631.—This is alſo confirmed by the following ſentence in ZUINGLE's book concerning *Baptiſm*: (tom. ii. opp. p. 85.) *Cœna Dominica non aliud, quam Commemorationis nomen meretur.* Compare with all this FUESLINI *Centur.* I. *Epiſtolar. Theologor. Reformator.* p. 255. 262, &c.

---

[o] CALVIN, in reality, enjoyed the power and authority of a biſhop at *Geneva*; for, as long as he lived, he preſided in the aſſembly of the clergy, and in the *Conſiſtory* or eccleſiaſtical judicatory. But when he was at the point of death, he adviſed the clergy not to give him a ſucceſſor, and proved to them evidently the dangerous conſequences of entruſting with any one man, during life, a place of ſuch high authority. After him, therefore, the place of preſident ceaſed to be perpetual. See SPON, *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 111.

The form of doctrine and eccleſiaſtical government drawn up by this Reformer.

XII. The plan of doctrine and diſcipline, that had been formed by ZUINGLE, was altered and corrected by CALVIN; and that more eſpecially in three points, of which it will not be improper to give a particular account.

1ſt, ZUINGLE, in his form of eccleſiaſtical government, had given an abſolute and unbounded power, in religious matters, to the civil magiſtrate, to whom he had placed the clergy in a degree of ſubjection that was diſpleaſing to many. But at the ſame time he allowed of a certain ſubordination and difference of rank among the miniſters of the church, and even thought it expedient to place at their head a perpetual preſident, or ſuperintendent, with a certain degree of inſpection and authority over the whole body. CALVIN, on the contrary, reduced the power of the magiſtrate, in religious matters, within narrow bounds. He declared the church a ſeparate and independent body, endowed with the power of legiſlation for itſelf. He maintained, that it was to be governed, like the primitive church, only by *preſbyteries* and *ſynods*, that is, by aſſemblies of *elders*, compoſed both of the clergy and laity; and he left to the civil magiſtrate little else than the privilege of protecting and defending the church, and providing for what related to its external exigencies and concerns. Thus this eminent Reformer introduced into the republic of *Geneva*, and endeavoured to introduce into all the Reformed churches throughout *Europe*, that Form of eccleſiaſtical government, which is called *Preſbyterian*, from its neither admitting of the inſtitution of biſhops, nor of any ſubordination among the clergy; and which is founded on this principle, that all miniſters of the goſpel are, by the law of God, declared to be equal in rank and authority. In conſequence of this principle, he eſtabliſhed at *Geneva* a *conſiſtory*, compoſed of *ruling elders*, partly *paſtors*, and partly *laymen*, and inveſted this eccleſiaſtical body with a high degree of power and authority. He alſo convened ſynods, compoſed of the ruling elders of different churches, and in theſe conſiſtories and ſynods had laws enacted for the regulation of all matters of a religious nature; and among other things, reſtored to its former vigour the ancient practice of *excommunication*. All theſe things were done with the conſent of the greateſt part of the ſenate of *Geneva*.

---

[p] The various projects and plans that were formed, conducted, and executed with equal prudence and reſolution by CALVIN, in behalf both of the republic and church of *Geneva*, are related by the learned perſon, who, in the year 1730, gave a new edition (enriched with intereſting hiſtorical notes, and authentic documents) of SPON's *Hiſtoire de Geneve*. The particular accounts of CALVIN's tranſactions, given by this anonymous editor, in his notes, are drawn from ſeveral curious manuſcripts of undoubted credit. See SPON, *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 87. 100, &c.

2dly, The ſyſtem that ZUINGLE had adopted with reſpect to the euchariſt, was by no means agreeable to CALVIN, who, in order to facilitate the deſired union with the Lutheran church, ſubſtituted in its place another, which appeared more conformable to the doctrine of that church, and, in reality, differed but little from it. For while the doctrine of ZUINGLE ſuppoſed only a *ſymbolical*, or figurative, *preſence* of the body and blood of CHRIST in the euchariſt, and repreſented a pious remembrance of CHRIST's death, and of the benefits it procured to mankind, as the only fruits that aroſe from the celebration of the Lord's ſupper, CALVIN explained this critical point in a quite different manner. He acknowledged a *real*, though *ſpiritual*, *preſence* of CHRIST in this ſacrament; or, in other words, he maintained, that true Chriſtians, who approached this holy ordinance with a lively faith, were, in a certain manner, united to the man CHRIST; and that from this union the ſpiritual life derived new vigour in the ſoul, and was ſtill carried on, in a progreſſive motion, to greater degrees of purity and perfection. This kind of language had been uſed in the forms of doctrine drawn up by LUTHER; and as CALVIN obſerved, among other things, that the *divine grace* was *conferred* upon ſinners, and *ſealed* to them by the celebration of the Lord's ſupper, this induced many to ſuppoſe that he adopted the ſentiment implied in the barbarous term *impanation* [q], and differed but little from the doctrine of the Lutheran church on this important

---

☞ [q] The term *Impanation* (which ſignifies here the *preſence* of CHRIST's body in the euchariſt, *in* or *with* the *bread*, that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called *Conſubſtantiation*. It was a modification of the monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, firſt invented by ſome of the diſciples of BERENGER, who had not a mind to break all meaſures with the church of *Rome*, and was afterwards adopted by LUTHER and his followers, who, in reality, made ſad work of it. For, in order to give it ſome faint air of poſſibility, and to maintain it as well as they could, they fell into a wretched ſcholaſtic jargon about the nature of *ſubſtances*, *ſubſiſtences*, *attributes*, *properties* and *accidents*, that did infinite miſchief to the true and ſublime ſcience of goſpel theology, whoſe beautiful ſimplicity it was adapted to deſtroy. The very ſame perplexity and darkneſs, the ſame quibbling, ſophiſtical and unintelligible logic, that reigned in the attempts of the Roman-catholics to defend the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, were viſible in the controverſial writings of the Lutherans in behalf of *Conſubſtantiation*, or *Impanation*. The latter had, indeed, one abſurdity leſs to maintain; but being obliged to aſſert, in oppoſition to intuitive evidence and unchangeable truth, that the *ſame* body can be in *many* places at the ſame time, they were conſequently obliged to have recourſe to the darkeſt and moſt intricate jargon of the ſchools, to hide the nonſenſe of this unaccountable doctrine. The modern Lutherans are grown ſomewhat wiſer in this reſpect; at leaſt, they ſeem leſs zealous than their anceſtors about the tenet in queſtion.

portant ſubject [r]. Be that as it may, his ſentiments differed conſiderably from thoſe of ZUINGLE; for while the latter aſſerted, that all Chriſtians, without diſtinction, whether *regenerate* or *unregenerate*, might be partakers of the body and blood of CHRIST; CALVIN confined this privilege to the pious and *regenerate* believer alone.

3dly, The *abſolute decree* of God, with reſpect to the future and everlaſting condition of the human race, which made no part of the theology of ZUINGLE, was an eſſential tenet in the creed of CALVIN, who inculcated with zeal the following doctrine: *That God, in predeſtinating, from all eternity, one part of mankind to everlaſting happineſs, and another to endleſs miſery, was led to make this diſtinction by no other motive than his own* GOOD PLEASURE *and* FREE WILL.

XIII. The firſt of the three points now mentioned, was of ſuch a nature, that great as the credit and influence of CALVIN were, he could

These changes made by Calvin are not approved of, nor received by all the Reformed churches.

---

[r] See FUESLINI *Centur.* I. *Epiſtol. Theolog. Reformat.* tom. i. p. 255. 266. 262, 263.—*Lettres de Calvin à Monſ. Jac. de Falaiſe*, p. 84, 85.—We learn in FUESLIN, p. 263. that CALVIN wrote to BUCER a letter, intimating that he approved of his ſentiments. It is poſſible, that he may have derived from BUCER the opinion he entertained with reſpect to the euchariſt.—See BOSSUET, *Hiſtoire des Variations des Egliſes Proteſtantes*, tom. ii. p. 8. 14. 19.—COURAYER, *Examen des Defauts des Theologiens*, tom. ii. p. 72. Theſe two writers pretend, that the ſentiments of CALVIN, with reſpect to the euchariſt, were almoſt the ſame with thoſe of the Roman-catholics *. The truth of this matter is, that the obſcurity and inconſiſtency with which this great man expreſſed himſelf upon that ſubject, render it extremely difficult to give a clear and accurate account of his doctrine.

* How it could come into the heads of ſuch men as BOSSUET and doctor COURAYER to ſay, that the *ſentiments of* CALVIN *concerning the euchariſt were almoſt the ſame with thoſe of the Roman-catholics*, is, indeed, ſtrange enough. The doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* was to CALVIN an invincible obſtacle to any ſort of conformity between him and *Rome* on that ſubject. For however obſcure and figurative his expreſſions with reſpect to CHRIST's *ſpiritual* preſence in the euchariſt may have been, he never once dreamed of any thing like a *corporal* preſence in that Holy Sacrament.

not procure a univerſal reception for it in the Reformed churches. The Engliſh and Germans rejected it; and even the Swiſs refuſed to adopt it. It was, however, received by the Reformed churches in *France*, *Holland*, and *Scotland*. The Swiſs remained firm in their oppoſition: they would not ſuffer the form of eccleſiaſtical government, that had once been eſtabliſhed under the inſpection of ZUINGLE, to be changed in any reſpect, nor the power of the civil magiſtrate, in religious matters, to receive the ſmalleſt prejudice. The other two points were long debated, even in *Switzerland*, with the greateſt warmth. Several churches, more eſpecially thoſe of *Zurich* and *Bern*, maintained obſtinately the doctrine of ZUINGLE in relation to the euchariſt [s]; neither could they be eaſily perſuaded to admit, as an article of faith, the doctrine of *predeſtination*, as it had been taught by CALVIN [t]. The prudence, however, of this great man, ſeconded by his reſolute perſeverance and his extraordinary credit, triumphed at length ſo far, as to bring about an union between the Swiſs churches and that of *Geneva*, firſt in relation to the doctrine of the euchariſt [u], and afterwards alſo on the ſubject of *predeſtination* [w]. The followers of CALVIN extended ſtill farther the triumphs of their chief, and improved with ſuch ſucceſs the footing he had gained, that, in proceſs of time, almoſt all the Reformed churches adopted his theological ſyſtem, to which, no doubt, his learned writings contributed a good deal [x].

---

[s] See FUESLINI *Centur. Epiſtolar.* p. 264.—*Muſeum Helvet.* tom. i. p. 490. tom. v. p. 479. 483. 490. tom. ii. p. 79.

[t] Beſides RUCHAT and HOTTINGER, ſee *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 105. 107. 117.—GERDES, *Miſcellan. Groningenſ. Nova*, tom. ii. p. 476, 477.

[u] The agreement between the churches of *Switzerland* and that of *Geneva* was concluded in 1549 and 1554.

[w] See the *Conſenſus Genev. et Tigurinor.* in CALVINI *Opuſculis*, p. 754.

The progreſs of Calvin's ſyſtem in *Germany*;

XIV. It will not be improper to paſs in review the different countries in which the doctrine and diſcipline of the Reformed church, as modelled by CALVIN, were eſtabliſhed in a fixed and permanent manner. Among its chief patrons in *Germany* we may reckon FREDERICK III., elector *Palatine*, who, in the year 1560, removed from their paſtoral functions the Lutheran doctors, and filled their places with Calviniſts; and, at the ſame time, obliged his ſubjects to embrace the tenets, rites, and inſtitutions, of the church of *Geneva* [y]. This order was indeed abrogated, in the year 1576, by his ſon and ſucceſſor LEWIS, who reſtored Lutheraniſm to its former credit and authority. The effects of this revolution were, however, but tranſitory; for, in the year 1583, under the government of the elector JOHN CASIMIR, who had followed the example of his brother FREDERICK in embracing the diſcipline of the Reformed church, the face of things was again changed in favour of Calviniſm, which reſumed what it had loſt, and became triumphant [z]. From this period the church of the Palatinate obtained the ſecond place among the Reformed churches; and its influence and reputation were ſo conſiderable, that the *Form of inſtruction*, which was compoſed for its uſe by URSINUS, and which is known under the title of the *Catechiſm of Heidelberg*, was almoſt univerſally adopted by the Calviniſts [*a*]. The republic of *Bremen* embraced, alſo, the doctrine and inſtitutions of the Reformed. ALBERT HARDENBERG, the intimate friend of MELANCTHON, was the firſt who attempted to introduce there the doctrine of CALVIN concerning the euchariſt. This attempt he made ſo early as the year 1556; and, though a powerful oppoſition rendered it unſucceſsful, and procured the expulſion of its author out of the city of *Bremen*, yet the latent ſeeds of Calviniſm took root, and, towards the concluſion of this century, acquired ſuch ſtrength, that no meaſures either of prudence or force were ſufficient to prevent the church of *Bremen* from modelling its faith, worſhip, and government, after that of *Geneva* [*b*]. The various motives that engaged other German ſtates to adopt, by degrees, the ſame ſentiments, and the incidents and circumſtances that favoured the progreſs of Calviniſm in the empire, muſt be ſought in thoſe writers, who have undertaken to give a full, complete, and ample hiſtory of the Chriſtian church.

---

[x] The learned DAN. ERN. JABLONSKY, in his *Letters to Leibnitz*, publiſhed by KAPPIUS, maintains (p. 24, 25. 41.), that the opinion of ZUINGLE has no longer any patrons among the Reformed. But this is a palpable miſtake. For its patrons and defenders are, on the contrary, extremely numerous; and at this very time the doctrine of ZUINGLE is revived in *England*, *Switzerland*, and other countries, and ſeems to acquire new degrees of credit from day to day.

[y] HEN. ALTINGII *Hiſt. Eccl. Palat.* in LUD. CHR. MIEGII *Monum. Palat.* tom. i. p. 223.—LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part II. lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 125.—SALIG, *Hiſt. Confeſſion. Aug.* tom. iii. lib. ix. cap. v. p. 433.

[z] ALTING. *loc. cit.*—LOSCHERUS, *ibid.* part III. lib. vi. p. 234.—See alſo a German work, entitled, GOTTH. STRUVIUS, *Pfaelziſche Kirchen Hiſtorie*, p. 110.

and in *France*.

XV. Thoſe among the French, who firſt renounced the juriſdiction and doctrine of the church of *Rome*, are commonly called Lutherans by the writers of theſe early times. This denomination, joined to other circumſtances, has engaged ſome to imagine, that theſe French converts to the proteſtant cauſe were attached to the tenets of the Lutheran church, and averſe to thoſe of the Swiſs doctors [*c*]. But this is by no means a juſt repreſentation of the matter. It appears much more probable, that the firſt French proteſtants were uniform in nothing but their antipathy to the church of *Rome*, and that, this point being excepted, there was a great variety in their religious ſentiments. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the vicinity of *Geneva*, *Lauſanne*, and other cities which had adopted the doctrine of CALVIN, together with the incredible zeal of this eminent man, and his two colleagues FAREL and BEZA, in nouriſhing the oppoſition to the church of *Rome*, and augmenting both the indignation and number of its enemies, produced a very remarkable effect upon the French churches; for, about the middle of this century, they all, without exception, entered into the bonds of fraternal communion with the church of *Geneva*. The French proteſtants were called, by their enemies, *Huguenots*, by way of deriſion and contempt; the origin, however, of this denomination is extremely uncertain [*d*]. Their

---

[*a*] For an account of the catechiſm of *Heidelberg*, ſee KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 593 and 308.

[*b*] SALIG, *loc. cit.* part III. lib. x. cap. v. p. 715. & cap. vi. p. 776.—LOSCHERUS, *loc. cit.* part II. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 134. & part III. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 276.—GERDES, *Hiſtoria Renovati Evangelii*, tom. iii. p. 157.

[*c*] LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part II. cap. vi. p. 46.— SALIG, *Hiſt. Aug. Confeſſion.* tom. ii. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 190.

☞ [*d*] Some etymologiſts ſuppoſe this term derived from HUGUON, a word uſed in *Touraine*, to ſignify *perſons that walk at night in the ſtreets*. And as the firſt proteſtants, like the firſt Chriſtians, may have choſen that ſeaſon for their religious aſſemblies through the fear of perſecution, the nickname of *Huguenot* may, naturally enough, have been applied to them by their enemies. Others are of opinion, that it was derived from a French and faulty pronunciation of the German word *Eidgnoſſen*, which ſignifies *confederates*, and had been originally the name of that valiant part of the city of *Geneva*, which entered into an alliance with the Swiſs Cantons, in order to maintain their liberties againſt the tyrannical attempts of CHARLE III., duke of *Savoy*. Theſe confederates were called *Eignots*, and from thence, very probably, was derived the word *Huguenots* now under conſideration. The Count

Their fate was ſevere; the ſtorms of perſecution aſſailed them with unparalleled fury; and, though many princes of the royal blood, and a great number of the flower of the nobility, adopted their ſentiments, and ſtood forth in their cauſe [*e*], yet it may nevertheleſs be affirmed, that no other part of the Reformed church ſuffered ſo grievouſly as they did for the ſake of religion. Even the peace, which they obtained from Henry III. in the year 1576, was the ſource of that civil war, in which the powerful and ambitious houſe of *Guiſe*, inſtigated by the ſanguinary ſuggeſtions of the Roman pontifs, aimed at nothing leſs than the extirpation of the royal family, and the utter ruin of the proteſtant religion; while the Huguenots, on the other hand, headed by leaders of the moſt heroic valour and the moſt illuſtrious rank, combated for their religion and for their ſovereigns with various ſucceſs. Theſe dreadful commotions, in which both the contending parties committed ſuch deeds as are yet, and always will be, remembered with horror, were, at length, calmed by the fortitude and prudence of HENRY IV. This monarch, indeed, ſacrificed the dictates of conſcience to the ſuggeſtions of policy; and imagining, that his government could have no ſtable nor ſolid foundation, as long as he perſiſted in diſowning the authority and juriſdiction of *Rome*,

---

Count VILLARS, in a letter written to the king of *France*, from the province of *Languedoc*, where he was lieutenant-general, and dated the 11th of November, 1560, calls the riotous Calviniſts of the Cevennes, *Huguenots*, and this is the firſt time that this term is found, in the regiſters of that province, applied to the proteſtants.

[*e*] See the *Hiſtoire Ecclef. des Egliſes Reformées au Royaume de France*, publiſhed at *Antwerp*, in three volumes 8vo. in the year 1580, and ſuppoſed by many to have been written by BEZA. The writers that have given the beſt accounts of the French reformed churches, their confeſſion of faith, and their forms of worſhip and diſcipline, are enumerated by KOCHERUS, in his *Bibliotheca Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 299.

he renounced the Reformed religion, and made a ſolemn and public profeſſion of popery. Perceiving, however, on the other hand, that it was not poſſible either to extirpate or ſuppreſs entirely the proteſtant religion, he granted to its profeſſors, by the famous edict drawn up at *Nantes* in the year 1598, the liberty of ſerving God according to their conſciences [*f*], and a full ſecurity for the enjoyment of their civil rights and privileges, without perſecution or moleſtation from any quarter [*g*].

In *England* and *Scotland*.

XVI. The church of *Scotland* acknowledges as its founder JOHN KNOX, the diſciple of CALVIN; and, accordingly, from its firſt reformation, it adopted the doctrine, rites, and form of eccleſiaſtical government eſtabliſhed at *Geneva*. Theſe it has always adhered to with the utmoſt uniformity, and maintained with the greateſt jealouſy and zeal; ſo that even in the laſt century the deſigns of thoſe who attempted to introduce certain changes into its diſcipline and worſhip, were publicly oppoſed by the force of arms [*h*].

A quite different conſtitution of things is obſervable in the church of *England*, which could

---

☞ [*f*] This edict reſtored and confirmed, in the fulleſt terms, all the favours that had ever been granted to the proteſtants by other princes, and particularly by HENRY III. To theſe privileges others were alſo added, which had never been granted, nor even demanded, before: ſuch as a free admiſſion to all employments of truſt, honour, and profit; the eſtabliſhing courts and chambers in which the profeſſors of the two religions were equal in number; and the permitting the children of proteſtants to be educated, without any moleſtation or conſtraint, in the public Univerſities.

[*g*] BENOIT, *Hiſtoire de l' Edit. de Nantes*, tom. i. lib. v. p. 200.—DANIEL, *Hiſt. de France*, tom. ix. p. 409.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. vi.

[*h*] SALIG. *Hiſt. Aug. Confeſſion.* part II. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 403.—☞ Dr. MOSHEIM alludes, in this paſſage, to the attempts made under the reign of CHARLES II., to introduce epiſcopacy into *Scotland.*

never be brought to an entire compliance with the eccleſiaſtical laws of *Geneva*, and which retained, but for a ſhort time, even thoſe which it adopted. It is well known, that the greateſt part of thoſe Engliſh, who firſt threw off the yoke of *Rome*, ſeemed much more inclined to the ſentiments of LUTHER concerning the euchariſt, the form of public worſhip, and eccleſiaſtical government, than to thoſe of the Swiſs churches. But the ſcene changed after the death of HENRY VIII., when, by the induſtrious zeal of CALVIN, and his diſciples, more eſpecially PETER MARTYR, the cauſe of Lutheraniſm loſt ground conſiderably; and the univerſities, ſchools, and churches became the oracles of Calviniſm, which alſo acquired new votaries among the people from day to day [i]. Hence it happened, that when it was propoſed, under the reign of EDWARD VI., to give a fixed and ſtable form to the doctrine and diſcipline of the church, *Geneva* was acknowledged as a ſiſter church; and the theological ſyſtem, there eſtabliſhed by CALVIN, was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in *England*. This, however, was done without any change of the form of epiſcopal government, which had already taken place, and was entirely different from that of *Geneva*; nor was this ſtep attended with any alteration of ſeveral religious rites and ceremonies, which were looked upon as ſuperſtitious by the greateſt part of the Reformed. This difference, however, between the two churches, though it appeared at firſt of little conſequence, and, in the judgment even of CALVIN, was eſteemed an object of toleration and indulgence, was, nevertheleſs, in after-ages, a ſource of many calamities and diſſenſions, that were highly detrimental both to the civil and eccleſiaſtical conſtitution of *Great Britain.*

---

[i] LOSCHERI *Hiſt. Motuum*, part II. lib. iii. cap. vii. p. 67. —SALIG. *Hiſt. Aug. Confeſſion*. tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 317.

The riſe of the Puritans.

XVII. The origin of theſe unhappy diſſenſions, which it has not as yet been poſſible entirely to heal, muſt be ſought for in the conduct of thoſe perſecuted fugitives, who, to ſave their lives, their families, and their fortunes, from the bloody rage and inhuman tyranny of queen MARY, left the places of their nativity in the year 1554, and took refuge in *Germany* [k]. Of theſe fugitive

---

☞ [k] I cannot help mentioning the uncharitableneſs of the Lutherans, upon this occaſion, who hated theſe unhappy exiles, becauſe they were *Sacramentarians* (for ſo the Lutherans called thoſe who denied CHRIST's bodily preſence in the eucharist), and expelled from their cities ſuch of the Engliſh proteſtants as repaired to them, as a refuge from popiſh ſuperſtition and perſecution. Such as ſought for ſhelter in *France*, *Geneva*, and thoſe parts of *Switzerland* and *Germany* where the Reformation had taken place, and where Lutheraniſm was not profeſſed, were received with great humanity, and allowed places of public worſhip. But it was at *Franckfort* that the exiles were moſt numerous; and there began the conteſt and diviſion which gave riſe to that ſeparation from the church of *England* which continues to this day. It is, however, a piece of juſtice due to the memory of the excellent MELANCTHON, to obſerve, that he warmly condemned this uncharitable treatment, and more eſpecially the indecent reproaches, which the Lutherans caſt upon the Engliſh Martyrs who had ſealed the Reformation with their blood, calling them the *Devil's Martyrs*. *Vociferantur quidam* (ſays this amiable Reformer) *Martyres Anglicos eſſe Martyres Diaboli. Nolim hac contumelia afficere ſanctum ſpiritum in Latimero, qui annum octogeſimum egreſſus fuit, et in aliis ſanctis viris, quos novi.* Theſe are the words of this truly Chriſtian Reformer, in one of his letters to CAMERARIUS, *Epiſt.* lib. iv. p. 959. and in another of his letters, ſpeaking of the burning of BURGIUS at *Paris*, he thus ſeverely cenſures WESTPHAL's intolerant principles: *Tales viros ait Weſtphalus eſſe Diaboli Martyres. Hanc judicii perverſitatem quis non deteſtetur? Ep.* lib. ii. p. 387. Such were the humane and liberal ſentiments of MELANCTHON, which have rendered his name ſo precious to the lovers of piety, probity, and moderation; while the zealots of his own church have treated his memory with obloquy, and compoſed diſſertations *de Indifferentiſmo Melancthonis.* N.

congregations *ſome* performed divine worſhip with the rites that had been authorized by EDWARD VI.; while *others* preferred the Swiſs method of worſhip as more recommendable on account of its purity and ſimplicity.. The former were called *Conformiſts*, on account of their compliance with the eccleſiaſtical laws enacted by the prince now mentioned; and the denominations of *Non-conformiſts* and *Puritans* were given to the latter, from their inſiſting upon a form of worſhip, more exempt from ſuperſtition, and of a more pure kind, than the liturgy of EDWARD ſeemed to them to be. Theſe denominations became permanent marks of diſtinction, which ſtill continue to denote thoſe different religious communities which divide the Britiſh nation. The controverſy concerning the ceremonial part of divine worſhip, that had divided the exiles abroad, changed ſcenes, and was removed with them to *England*; when the auſpicious ſucceſſion of queen ELIZABETH to the throne permitted them to return to their native country. The hopes of enjoying liberty, and of promoting each their reſpective ſyſtems, increaſed their conteſts inſtead of diminiſhing them; and the breach widened to ſuch a degree, that the moſt ſagacious and provident obſervers of things ſeemed to deſpair of ſeeing it healed. The wiſe queen, in her deſign to accompliſh the reformation of the church, was fully reſolved not to confine herſelf to the model exhibited by the proteſtants of *Geneva*, and their adherents to the *Puritans*; and, therefore, ſhe recommended to the attention and imitation of the doctors, that were employed in this weighty and important matter, the practice and inſtitutions of the primitive ages [*l*]. When her plan was put

---

☞ [*l*] Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems diſpoſed, by this ambiguous expreſſion of the *primitive ages*, to inſinuate that queen ELIZABETH put in execution, and the face of the church was changed and reformed by new rules of diſcipline, and purer forms of public worſhip, the famous *Act of Uniformity* was iſſued forth, by which all her ſubjects were commanded to obſerve theſe rules, and to ſubmit to the reformation of the church on the footing on which it was now placed by the queen, as its ſupreme viſible head upon earth. The *Puritans* refuſed their aſſent to theſe proceedings; pleaded the dictates of their conſciences in behalf of this refuſal; and complained heavily, that the groſs ſuperſtitions of popery, which they had looked upon as abrogated and aboliſhed, were now revived, and even impoſed by authority. They were not, indeed, all equally exaſperated againſt the new conſtitution of the church; nor did they in effect carry their oppoſition to equal degrees of exceſs. The more violent demanded the total abrogation of all that had been done towards the eſtabliſhment of a national religion, and required nothing leſs than that the church of *England* ſhould be exactly modelled after that of *Geneva*. The milder and more mo-

---

ZABETH had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious diſcipline and worſhip. It is, however, certain, that, inſtead of being willing to ſtrip religion of the ceremonies which remained in it, ſhe was rather inclined to bring the public worſhip ſtill nearer the Romiſh ritual *, and had a great propenſity to ſeveral uſages in the church of *Rome*, which were juſtly looked upon as ſuperſtitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains, who had preached in defence of the *real preſence*; ſhe was fond of images, and retained ſome in her private chapel †; and would undoubtedly have forbid the marriage of the clergy, if CECIL, her ſecretary, had not interpoſed ‡. Having appointed a committee of divines to review King EDWARD's Liturgy, ſhe gave them an order to ſtrike out all offenſive paſſages againſt the pope, and to make people eaſy about the corporal preſence of CHRIST in the ſacrament §.

* HEYLIN, p. 124.

† Id. ibid.

‡ STRYPE's *Life of Parker*, p. 107, 108, 109.

§ NEAL's *Hiſt. of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 138.

derate *Puritans* were much more equitable in their demands, and only deſired liberty of conſcience, with the privilege of celebrating divine worſhip in their own way. The queen did not judge it proper to grant to either the object of their requeſts, but rather intent upon the ſuppreſſion of this troubleſome ſect (as ſhe was uſed to call it), permitted its enemies to employ for that purpoſe all the reſources of artifice, and all the ſeverity of the laws. Thus was that form of religion eſtabliſhed in *Britain*, which ſeparated the *Engliſh* equally from the church of *Rome* on the one hand, and from the other churches which had renounced popery, on the other; but which, at the ſame time, laid a perpetual foundation for diſſenſion and feuds, in that otherwiſe happy and proſperous nation [m].

The ſentiments and doctrine of the Puritans.

XVIII. The incident that gave riſe to theſe unhappy diviſions, which were productive of ſo many and ſuch dreadful calamities, was a matter of very ſmall moment, and which did not ſeem to affect, in any way, the intereſts of true religion and virtue. The chief leaders among the *Puritans* entertained a ſtrong averſion to the veſtments worn by the Engliſh clergy in the celebration of divine worſhip. As theſe habits had been made uſe of in the times of popery, and ſeemed to renew the impreſſions that had been made upon the people by the Romiſh prieſts, they appeared to the *Puritans* in no other light than as the *enſigns of Antichriſt*. The ſpirit of oppoſition, being once ſet on foot, proceeded, in its remonſtrances, to matters of ſuperior moment. The form of eccleſiaſtical government, eſtabliſhed in *England*, was one of the firſt and main grievances of which the *Puritans* complained. They looked upon this form as quite different from that which had been inſtituted by CHRIST, the great lawgiver of the church; and, in conformity with the ſentiments of CALVIN, maintained, that, by the divine law, all the miniſters of the goſpel were abſolutely equal in point of rank and authority. They did not indeed think it unlawful that a perſon, diſtinguiſhed by the title of a *biſhop*, or *ſuperintendant*, ſhould preſide in the aſſembly of the clergy, for the ſake of maintaining order and decency in their method of proceeding; but they thought it incongruous and abſurd, that the perſons inveſted with this character ſhould be ranked, as the biſhops had hitherto been, among the nobility of the kingdom, employed in civil and political affairs, and diſtinguiſhed ſo eminently by their wordly opulence and power. This controverſy was not carried on, however, with exceſſive animoſity and zeal, as long as the Engliſh biſhops pretended to derive their dignity and authority from no other ſource than the laws of their country, and pleaded a right, purely human, to the rank they held in church and ſtate. But the flame broke out with redoubled fury in the year 1588, when BANCROFT, afterwards archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, ventured to aſſert, that the order of biſhops was ſuperior to the body of preſbyters, not in conſequence of any human inſtitution, but by the expreſs appointment of God himſelf[n]. This doctrine was readily adopted by many, and the conſequences that ſeemed naturally to flow from it in favour of epiſcopal ordination, happened in effect, and gave new fuel to the flame of controverſy. For they who embraced the ſentiments of BANCROFT, conſidered all miniſters of the Goſpel, who had not received ordination from a biſhop, as irregularly inveſted with the ſacred character; and alſo maintained, that the clergy, in thoſe countries where there were no biſhops, were deſtitute of the gifts and qualifications that were neceſſary to the exerciſe of the paſtoral office, and were to be looked upon as inferior to the Roman-catholic prieſts.

---

[m] No writer has treated this part of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of *Britain* in a more ample and elegant manner than DANIEL NEAL, in his *Hiſtory of the Puritans, or Proteſtant Non-conformiſts*, in four volumes 8vo. The firſt part of this laborious work was publiſhed at *London*, in the year 1732, and the latter part in 1738. The author, who was himſelf a *Non-conformiſt*, has not indeed been able to impoſe ſilence ſo far on the warm and impetuous ſpirit of party, as not to diſcover a certain degree of partiality in favour of his brethren. For while he relates, in the moſt circumſtantial manner, all the injuries the *Puritans* received from the biſhops, and thoſe of the eſtabliſhed religion, he, in many places, diminiſhes, excuſes, or ſuppreſſes, the faults and failings of theſe ſeparatiſts. See alſo for an account of the religious hiſtory of theſe times, STRYPE's Lives of the archbiſhops of *Canterbury* under queen ELIZABETH, *viz.* PARKER, GRINDAL, and WHITGIFT.

XIX. All theſe things exaſperated the *Puritans*, whoſe complaints, however, were not confined to the objects already mentioned. There were many circumſtances that entered into their plan of reformation. They had a ſingular antipathy againſt *cathedral* churches, and demanded the abolition of the *archdeacons*, *deans*, *canons*, and other *officials*, that are ſupported by their lands and revenues. They diſapproved of the pompous manner of worſhip that is generally obſerved in theſe churches, and looked, particularly, upon inſtrumental muſic, as improperly employed in the ſervice of God. The ſeverity of their zeal was alſo very great; for they were of opinion, that, not open profligates, but even perſons whoſe piety was dubious, deſerved to be excluded from the communion of the church [o]; and they endeavoured to juſtify the rigour of this deciſion, by obſerving that the church, being the congregation of the faithful, nothing was more incumbent on its miniſters and rulers, than to watch againſt its being defiled by the preſence of perſons deſtitute of true faith and piety. They found, moreover, much ſubject of affliction and complaint in the rites and ceremonies that were impoſed by the order of the queen, and the authority of her council [p]; among theſe were the *feſtivals*

---

[n] See STRYPE's *Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, p. 121. ☞ The firſt Engliſh Reformers admitted but two orders of church-officers to be of *divine appointment*, viz. *biſhops* and *deacons*; a preſbyter and a biſhop, according to them, being but two names for the ſame office; but Dr. BANCROFT, in a ſermon, preached at *Paul's Croſs*, January 12, 1588, maintained, that the biſhops of *England* were a diſtinct order from *prieſts*, and had ſuperiority over them *jure divino*.

☞ [o] The Puritans juſtified themſelves in relation to this point, in a letter, addreſſed, from their priſon, to queen ELIZABETH, in the year 1592, by obſerving, that their ſentiments concerning *the perſons ſubject to excommunication,* and alſo concerning *the effects and extent of that act of church-diſcipline,* were conformable to thoſe of all the Reformed churches, and to the doctrine and practice of the church of *England* in particular. They declared more eſpecially, that, according to their ſenſe of things, the cenſure of excommunication deprived only of ſpiritual privileges and comforts, *without taking away either liberty, goods, lands, government private or public, or any other civil or earthly commodity of this life*; and thus they diſtinguiſhed themſelves from thoſe furious and fanatical anabaptiſts, who had committed ſuch diſorders in *Germany,* and ſome of whom were now making a noiſe in *England.*

☞ [p] By this council our author means, the *High Commiſſion Court,* of which it is proper to give here ſome account, as its proceedings eſſentially belong to the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of *England.* This court took its riſe from a remarkable clauſe in the *act of ſupremacy,* by which the queen and her ſucceſſors were empowered to chooſe perſons "*to exerciſe, under her, all manner of juriſdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any ſpiritual or eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction within the realms of* England *and* Ireland, *as alſo to viſit, reform, redreſs, order, correct, and amend all errors, hereſies, ſchiſms, abuſes, contempts, offences, enormities whatſoever.* Provided that they have no power to determine any thing to be hereſy, but what has been adjudged to be ſo *by the authority of the canonical ſcripture,* or by the *firſt four general councils,* or any of them; or by any other general council, wherein the ſame was declared hereſy by the expreſs and plain words of canonical ſcripture, or ſuch as ſhall hereafter be declared to be hereſy by the High Court of Parliament, with the aſſent *feſtivals* or *holidays* that were celebrated in honour of the ſaints, the uſe of the *ſign of the croſs* more eſpecially in the ſacrament of baptiſm, the nominating godfathers and godmothers as ſureties for the education of children whoſe parents were ſtill living [*q*], and the doctrine relating to the validity of lay-baptiſm [*r*]. They diſliked the reading

"ſent of the clergy in convocation." Upon the authority of this clauſe, the queen appointed a certain number of *commiſſioners* for eccleſiaſtical cauſes, who, in many inſtances, abuſed their power. The court, they compoſed, was called the *Court of High Commiſſion*, becauſe it claimed a more extenſive juriſdiction, and higher powers, than the ordinary *Courts of the Biſhops*. Its juriſdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the ſame with that which had been lodged in the ſingle perſon of Lord CROMWEL, vicar general of HENRY VIII. Theſe *Commiſſioners* were empowered to make enquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witneſſes, but by all other ways and means which they could deviſe, that is, by rack, torture, inquiſition, and impriſonment. They were veſted with a right to examine ſuch perſons as they ſuſpected, by adminiſtering to them an oath (not allowed of in their commiſſion, and therefore called *ex officio*) by which they were obliged to anſwer all queſtions, and thereby might be obliged to accuſe themſelves, or their moſt intimate friends. The fines they impoſed were merely diſcretionary; the impriſonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleaſure; they impoſed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy, and practiſed all the iniquities and cruelties of a real *Inquiſition*. See RAPIN's and HUME's Hiſtories of *England*, under the reign of ELIZABETH, and NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, paſſim.

☞ [*q*] Other rites and cuſtoms diſpleaſing to the Puritans, and omitted by our author, were, *kneeling at the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper*, *bowing at the name of Jeſus*, *giving the ring in marriage*, the prohibition of marriage during certain times of the year, and the licenſing it for money, as alſo the *confirmation of children* by *epiſcopal* impoſition of hands.

☞ [*r*] The words of the original are, *nec ſacris Chriſtianis pueros recens natos ab aliis, quam ſacerdotibus, initiari patiebantur*. The Roman-catholics, who look upon the external rite of baptiſm as *abſolutely neceſſary* to ſalvation; allow, conſequently, of its being performed by a lay-man, or a midwife, where a clergyman is not at hand, nay (if ſuch a ridiculous thing may be mentioned) by a ſurgeon, where a ſtill birth is apprehended, ing of the *apocryphal* books in the church; and, with reſpect to ſet forms of prayer, although they did not go ſo far as to inſiſt upon their being entirely aboliſhed, yet they pleaded for a right to every miniſter, of modifying, correcting, and uſing them in ſuch a manner, as might tend moſt to the advancement of true piety, and of addreſſing the Deity in ſuch terms as were ſuggeſted by their inward feelings, inſtead of thoſe that were dictated by others. In a word, they were of opinion, that the government and diſcipline of the church of *England* ought to have been modelled after the eccleſiaſtical laws and inſtitutions of *Geneva*, and that no indulgence was to be ſhewn to thoſe ceremonies or practices, which bore the ſmalleſt reſemblance of the diſcipline or worſhip of the church of *Rome*.

The principles on which the Puritans maintained their ſentiments concerning eccleſiaſtical government and divine worſhip.

XX. Theſe ſentiments, conſidered in themſelves, ſeemed neither ſuſceptible of a ſatisfactory defence, nor of a complete refutation. Their ſolidity or falſehood depended upon the principles from whence they were derived; and no regular controverſy could be carried on upon theſe matters, until the contending parties adopted ſome common and evident principles, by which they might corroborate their reſpective ſyſtems. It is only by an examination of theſe, that it can be known on what ſide truth lies, and what degree of utility or importance can be attributed to a conteſt of this nature. The principles laid down by the *queen's commiſſioners* on the one hand, and

apprehended. The church of *England*, though it teacheth in general, that none ought to baptiſe but men dedicated to the ſervice of God, yet doth not eſteem null baptiſm performed by laicks or women, becauſe it makes a difference between what is *eſſential* to a ſacrament, and what is requiſite to the *regular* way of uſing it. The Puritans, that they might neither preſcribe nor even connive at a practice that ſeemed to be founded on the abſolute neceſſity of infant baptiſm, would allow that ſacred rite to be performed by the clergy alone.

the *Puritans* on the other, were indeed very different.

For in the *firſt place*, The former maintained, that the right of reformation, that is, the privilege of removing the corruptions and of correcting the errors that may have been introduced into the doctrine, diſcipline, or worſhip of the church, is lodged in the ſovereign, or civil magiſtrate alone; while the latter denied, that the power of the magiſtrate extended ſo far, and maintained, that it was rather the buſineſs of the clergy to reſtore religion to its native dignity and luſtre. This was the opinion of Calvin, as has been already obſerved.

Secondly, The queen's commiſſioners maintained, that the rule of proceeding, in reforming the doctrine or diſcipline of the church, was not to be derived from the ſacred writings *alone*, but alſo from the writings and deciſions of the fathers in the primitive ages. The *Puritans*, on the contrary, affirmed, that the inſpired word of God being the pure and *only* fountain of wiſdom and truth, it was from thence *alone* that the rules and directions were to be drawn, which were to guide the meaſures of thoſe who undertook to purify the faith, or to rectify the diſcipline and worſhip, of the church; and that the eccleſiaſtical inſtitutions of the early ages, as alſo the writings of the ancient doctors, were abſolutely deſtitute of all ſort of authority.

Thirdly, The queen's commiſſioners ventured to aſſert, that the church of *Rome was a true church*, though corrupt and erroneous in many points of doctrine and government; that the Roman pontif, though chargeable with temerity and arrogance in aſſuming to himſelf the title and juriſdiction of head of the whole church, was, nevertheleſs, to be eſteemed a true and lawful biſhop; and, conſequently, that the miniſters ordained by him were qualified for performing the paſtoral duties. This was a point which the Engliſh biſhops thought it abſolutely neceſſary to maintain, ſince they could not otherwiſe claim the honour of deriving their dignities, in an uninterrupted line of ſucceſſion, from the apoſtles. But the *Puritans* entertained very different notions of this matter; they conſidered the Romiſh hierarchy as a ſyſtem of political and ſpiritual tyranny, that had juſtly forfeited the title and privileges of a true church; they looked upon its pontif as *Antichriſt*, and its diſcipline as vain, ſuperſtitious, idolatrous, and diametrically oppoſite to the injunctions of the goſpel; and in conſequence of this they renounced its communion, and regarded all approaches to its diſcipline and worſhip as highly dangerous to the cauſe of true religion.

Fourthly, The court commiſſioners conſidered as the beſt and moſt perfect form of eccleſiaſtical government, that which took place during the firſt four or five centuries; they even preferred it to that which had been inſtituted by the apoſtles, becauſe, as they alleged, our Saviour and his apoſtles had accommodated the Form, mentioned in Scripture, to the feeble and infant ſtate of the church, and left it to the wiſdom and diſcretion of future ages to modify it in ſuch a manner as might be ſuitable to the triumphant progreſs of Chriſtianity, the grandeur of a national eſtabliſhment, and alſo to the ends of civil policy. The *Puritans* aſſerted, in oppoſition to this, that the rules of church government were clearly laid down in the Holy Scriptures, the only ſtandard of ſpiritual diſcipline [*s*]; and that the apoſtles, in eſtabliſhing

---

☞ [*s*] By this they meant at leaſt, that nothing ſhould be impoſed as neceſſary, but what was expreſsly contained in the Holy Scriptures, or deduced from them by neceſſary conſequence.

eſtabliſhing the firſt Chriſtian church on the Ariſtocratical plan that was then obſerved in the Jewiſh Sanhedrim, deſigned it as an unchangeable model, to be followed in all times, and in all places.

Laſtly, The court reformers were of opinion, that things *indifferent*, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the authority of Scripture, ſuch as the external rites of public worſhip, the kind of veſtments that are to be uſed by the clergy, religious feſtivals, and the like, might be ordered, determined, and rendered a matter of obligation by the authority of the civil magiſtrate; and that, in ſuch a caſe, the violation of his commands would be no leſs criminal than an act of rebellion againſt the laws of the ſtate. The *Puritans* alleged, in anſwer to this aſſertion, that it was an indecent proſtitution of power to impoſe, as *neceſſary* and *indiſpenſable*, thoſe things which CHRIST had left in the claſs of matters *indifferent*; ſince this was a manifeſt incroachment upon that *liberty, with which* the Divine Saviour *had made us free*. To this they added, that ſuch rites and ceremonies as had been abuſed to idolatrous purpoſes, and had a manifeſt tendency to revive the impreſſions of ſuperſtition and popery in the minds of men, could by no means be conſidered as *indifferent*, but deſerved to be rejected without heſitation, as impious and profane. Such, in their eſtimation, were the religious ceremonies of ancient times, whoſe abrogation was refuſed by the queen and her council [*t*].

XXI. This

---

quence. They maintained ſtill farther, that ſuppoſing it proved, that all things neceſſary to the good government of the church could not be deduced from Holy Scripture, yet that the diſcretionary power of ſupplying this defect was not veſted in the civil magiſtrate, but in the ſpiritual officers of the church.

☞ [*t*]. Dr. MOSHEIM, in theſe five articles, has followed the account of this controverſy given by Mr. NEAL, in his *Hiſtory*

The Browniſts, a ſect of the Puritans.

XXI. This conteſt between the commiſſioners of the court, and their opponents, who deſired a more complete reformation than had yet taken place, would have been much more dangerous in its conſequences, had that party, that was diſtinguiſhed by the general denomination of *Puritans*, been united in their ſentiments, views, and meaſures. But the caſe was quite otherwiſe. For this large body, compoſed of perſons of different ranks, characters, opinions, and intentions, and unanimous in nothing but their antipathy againſt the forms of doctrine and diſcipline that were eſtabliſhed by law, was, all of a ſudden, divided into a variety of ſects; of which ſome ſpread abroad the deluſions of enthuſiaſm, which had turned their own brains; while others diſplayed their folly in inventing new and whimſical plans of church-government. The moſt famous of all theſe ſects was that which was formed, about the year 1581, by ROBERT BROWN, an inſinuating man, but very unſettled and inconſiſtent in his views and notions of things. This innovator did not differ, in point of doctrine, either from the church of *England*, or from the reſt of the *Puritans*; but he had formed new and ſingular notions concerning the nature of the church, and the rules

---

Hiſtory of the Puritans. This latter adds a ſixth article, not of debate, but of union, "Both parties (ſays he) agreed *too* "*well* in aſſerting the neceſſity of an uniformity of public "worſhip, and of calling in the ſword of the magiſtrate for the "ſupport and defence of their ſeveral principles, which they "made an ill uſe of in their turns, as they could graſp the "power into their hands. The ſtandard of uniformity, ac"cording to the biſhops, was the *queen's ſupremacy*, and the "*laws of the land*; according to the Puritans, the *decrees of* "*provincial and national ſynods*, allowed and enforced by the "civil magiſtrate: But neither party were for admitting that "liberty of conſcience, and freedom of profeſſion, which is "every man's right, as far as is conſiſtent with the peace of the "government under which he lives."

of eccleſiaſtical government. He was for dividing the whole body of the faithful into ſeparate ſocieties or congregations, not larger than thoſe which were formed by the apoſtles in the infancy of Chriſtianity; and maintained, that ſuch a number of perſons, as could be contained in an ordinary place of worſhip, ought to be conſidered as a *church*, and enjoy all the rights and privileges that are competent to an eccleſiaſtical community. Theſe ſmall ſocieties he pronounced *independent*, *jure divino*, and entirely exempt from the juriſdiction of the biſhops, in whoſe hands the court placed the reins of ſpiritual government; and alſo from that of *ſynods*, which the Puritans regarded as the ſupreme viſible ſources of eccleſiaſtical authority. He alſo maintained, that the power of governing each congregation, and providing for its welfare, reſided in the people; and that each member had an equal ſhare in this direction, and an equal right to order matters for the good of the whole ſociety [u]. Hence all points both of doctrine and diſcipline were ſubmitted to the diſcuſſion of the whole congregation, and whatever was ſupported by a majority of votes paſſed into a law. It was the congregation alſo that elected certain of the brethren to the office of paſtors, to perform the duty of public inſtruction, and the ſeveral branches of divine worſhip, reſerving, however, to themſelves the power of diſmiſſing

---

☞ [u] It is farther to be obſerved, that, according to this ſyſtem, one church was not entitled to exerciſe juriſdiction over another; but each might give the other counſel or admonition, if they walked in a diſorderly manner, or abandoned the capital truths of religion; and if the offending church did not receive the admonition, the others were to withdraw, and publicly diſown them as a church of CHRIST. On the other hand, the powers of their church officers were confined within the narrow limits of their own ſociety. The paſtor of a church might not adminiſter the ſacrament of baptiſm, or the Lord's ſupper, to any but thoſe of his own communion.

theſe miniſters, and reducing them to the condition of private members, whenever they ſhould think ſuch a change conducive to the ſpiritual advantage of the community. For theſe paſtors were not eſteemed ſuperior, either in ſanctity or rank, to the reſt of their brethren, nor diſtinguiſhed from them by any other circumſtance than the liberty of preaching and praying, which they derived from the free will and conſent of the congregation. It is, beſides, to be obſerved, that their right of preaching was, by no means, of an excluſive nature, or peculiar to them alone; ſince any member, that thought proper to exhort or inſtruct the Brethren, was abundantly indulged in the liberty of *propheſying* to the whole aſſembly. Accordingly, when the ordinary teacher or paſtor had finiſhed his diſcourſe, all the other Brethren were permitted to communicate in public their ſentiments and illuſtrations upon any uſeful or edifying ſubject, on which they ſuppoſed they could throw new light. In a word, BROWN aimed at nothing leſs than modelling the form of the church after that infant community that was founded by the apoſtles, without once conſidering the important changes both in the religious and civil ſtate of the world ſince that time, the influence that theſe changes muſt neceſſarily have upon all eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, and the particular circumſtances of the Chriſtian church, in conſequence of its former corruptions and its late reformation. And, if his notions were crude and chimerical, the zeal with which he and his aſſociates maintained and propagated them was intemperate and extravagant in the higheſt degree. For he affirmed, that all communion was to be broken off with thoſe religious ſocieties that were founded upon a different plan from his, and treated, more eſpecially the church of *England*, as a ſpurious church, whoſe miniſters were

CENT. XVI.
SECT. III.
PART II.

were unlawfully ordained, whoſe diſcipline was popiſh and antichriſtian, and whoſe ſacraments and inſtitutions were deſtitute of all efficacy and virtue. The ſect of this hot-headed innovator, not being able to endure the ſevere treatment which their oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed forms of religious government and worſhip had drawn upon them, from an adminiſtration that was not diſtinguiſhed by its mildneſs and indulgence, retired into the Netherlands, and founded churches at *Middleburg* in *Zealand*, and at *Amſterdam* and *Leyden* in the province of *Holland*; but their eſtabliſhments were neither ſolid nor durable [x]. Their founder returned into *England*, and, having renounced his principles of ſeparation, took orders in the eſtabliſhed church, and obtained a benefice [y]. The Puritan exiles, whom he thus abandoned, diſagreed among themſelves, ſplit into parties, and their affairs declined from day to day [z]. This engaged the wiſer part of them to mitigate the ſeverity of their founder's plan, and to ſoften the rigour of his uncharitable deciſions; and hence aroſe the community of the *Independents*, or *Congregational Brethren*, which ſtill ſubſiſts, and of

---

☞ [x] The Britiſh churches at *Amſterdam* and *Middleburg* are incorporated into the national Dutch church, and their paſtors are members of the Dutch ſynod, which is ſufficient to ſhew that there are at this time no traces of *Browniſm* or *Independency* in theſe churches. The church at *Leyden*, where ROBINSON had fixed the ſtandard of *independency* about the year 1595, was diſperſed; and it is very remarkable, that a part of this church, tranſplanting themſelves into *America*, laid the foundation of the colony of *New-England*.

☞ [y] BROWN, in his new preferment, forgot not only the rigour of his principles, but alſo the gravity of his former morals; for he led a very idle and diſſolute life. See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 376.

[z] NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. chap. vi.—HOORNBECKII *Summa Controverſ.* lib. x. p. 738.—FULLER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Britain*, book x. p. 168.

which an account ſhall be given in the hiſtory of the following century.

The ſtate of the Reformed church in the Netherlands;

XXII. In the Belgic provinces, the friends of the Reformation ſeemed for a long time uncertain, whether they ſhould embrace the communion of the Swiſs, or of the Lutheran church. Each of theſe had zealous friends and powerful patrons [a]. The matter was, nevertheleſs, decided in the year 1571, and the religious ſyſtem of Calvin was publicly adopted. For the Belgic confeſſion of faith, which then appeared [b], was drawn up in the ſpirit, and almoſt in the terms, of that which was received in the Reformed churches in *France*, and differed conſiderably, in ſeveral reſpects, from the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, but more eſpecially in the article relating to Christ's preſence in the euchariſt [c]. This will not appear ſurpriſing to thoſe who conſider the vicinity of the French to the Low-countries; the number of French proteſtants that were conſtantly paſſing or ſojourning there; the extraordinary reputation of Calvin, and of the academy of *Geneva*; as alſo, the indefatigable zeal of his diſciples in extending the limits of their church, and propagating, throughout all *Europe*, their ſyſtem of doctrine, diſcipline, and government. Be that as it may, from this period, the Dutch, who had before been denominated *Lutherans*, aſſumed univerſally the title of *Reformed*, in which alſo they imitated the French, by whom this title had been firſt invented and adopted. It is true, indeed, that, as long as they were ſubject to the Spaniſh yoke, the fear of expoſing themſelves to the diſpleaſure

---

[a] Loscheri *Hiſtor. Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. iv. p. 74.

[b] Kocheri *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ*, p. 216.

[c] See Brandt's *Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Netherlands* (written in Dutch), vol. i. book v. p. 253.

of

of that ſovereign induced them to avoid the title of *Reformed*, and to call themſelves *Aſſociates of the Brethren of the Confeſſion of Augſburg*. For the Lutherans were eſteemed, by the Spaniſh court, much better ſubjects than the diſciples of CALVIN, who, on account of the tumults that had lately prevailed in *France*, were ſuppoſed to have a greater propenſity to mutiny and ſedition [*d*].

and in *Poland*.

XXIII. The light of the Reformation was firſt brought from *Saxony* into *Poland* by the diſciples of LUTHER. Some time after this happy period, the *Bohemian Brethren*, whom the Romiſh clergy had expelled from their country, as alſo ſeveral Helvetic doctors, propagated their ſentiments among the Polanders. Some congregations were alſo founded in that Republic by the *Anabaptiſts*, *Anti-Trinitarians*, and other ſectaries [*e*]. Hence it was, that three diſtinct communities, each of which adopted the main principles of the Reformation, were to be found in *Poland*, *viz.* the *Bohemian Brethren*, the *Lutherans*, and *Swiſs*. Theſe communities, in order to defend themſelves with the greater vigour againſt their common enemies, formed among themſelves a kind of confederacy, in a ſynod held at *Sendomir* in the year 1570, upon certain conditions, which were comprehended in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, that derives its

---

☞ [*d*] Dr. MOSHEIM advances this on the authority of a paſſage in BRANDT's *Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Netherlands*, (p. 254, 255.) which is written in Dutch, and is, indeed, a moſt curious and valuable work, notwithſtanding the author's partiality towards the cauſe of Arminianiſm, of which he was one of the moſt reſpectable patrons.

[*e*] LOSCHERI *Hiſt. Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. iii. p. 36.—SALIG. *Hiſt. Aug. Confeſſion.* tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. iv, v. p. 516.—REGENVOLSCII *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicar.* lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 71.—SALIGNAC, *Hiſt. de Pologne*, tom. v. p. 40—KAUTZ, *Præcipua Relig. Evangel. in Polonia Fata*, publiſhed in 4to, at *Hamburgh*, in the year 1738.

title from the city now mentioned [*f*]. But as this aſſociation ſeemed rather adapted to accelerate the concluſion of a peace, than to promote the cauſe of truth, the points in debate between the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* being expreſſed in this reconciling confeſſion in vague and ambiguous terms, it was ſoon after this warmly oppoſed by many of the former, and was entirely annulled in the following century. Many attempts have, indeed, been made to revive it; but they have not anſwered the expectations of thoſe who have employed their dexterity and zeal in this matter. In *Pruſſia*, the *Reformed* gained ground after the death of LUTHER and MELANCTHON, and founded the flouriſhing churches that ſtill ſubſiſt in that country [*g*].

The Bohemian Brethren.

XXIV. The *Bohemian*, or, as they are otherwiſe called, the *Moravian Brethren*, who deſcended from the better ſort of Huſſites, and were diſtinguiſhed by ſeveral religious inſtitutions of a ſingular nature, and well adapted to guard their community againſt the reigning vices and corruptions of the times, had no ſooner heard of LUTHER'S deſign of reforming the church, than they ſent deputies, in the year 1522, to recommend themſelves to his friendſhip and good offices. In ſucceeding times, they continued to diſcover the ſame zealous attachment to the Lutheran churches in *Saxony*, and alſo to thoſe that were founded in other countries. Theſe offers could not be well accepted without a previous examination of their religious ſentiments and principles. And, indeed, this examination turned to their advantage; for neither LUTHER nor his diſciples found any thing, either in their doctrine or diſcipline, that was, in any great meaſure, liable to cenſure; and though he could not approve, in every particular, of their *Confeſſion of Faith*, which they ſubmitted to his judgment, yet he looked upon it as an object of toleration and indulgence [*h*]. Nevertheleſs, the death of LUTHER, and the expulſion of theſe *Brethren* from their country in the year 1547, gave a new turn to their religious connexions; and great numbers of them, more eſpecially of thoſe who retired into *Poland*, embraced the religious ſentiments and diſcipline of the *Reformed*. The attachment of the Bohemians to the *Lutherans* ſeemed, indeed, to be revived by the *Convention of Sendomir*, already mentioned; but as the articles of union, that were drawn up in that aſſembly, loſt all their force and authority in a little time, the Bohemians, by degrees, entered one and all into the communion of the Swiſs church [*i*]. This union was, at firſt, formed on the expreſs condition, that the two churches ſhould continue to be governed by their reſpective laws and inſtitutions, and ſhould have ſeparate places of public worſhip; but, in the following century, all remains of diſſenſion were removed in the ſynods held at *Aſtrog* in the years 1620 and 1627, and the two congregations were formed into one, under the title of *The Church of the*

[*f*] See DAN. ERNEST. JABLONSKY, *Hiſtoria Conſenſus Sendomirenſis*, publiſhed at *Berlin* in 4to, in the year 1731; as alſo the *Epiſtola Apologetica* of the ſame author, in defence of the work now mentioned, againſt the objections of an anonymous author.

[*g*] LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part III. lib. vi. cap. i. p. 216.

[*h*] See a German work of CARPZOVIUS, entitled, *Nachricht von den Bohmiſchen Brudern*, p. 46. as alſo JO. CHR. KOCHERI *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 76.

[*i*] Beſides COMENIUS, CAMERARIUS, and LASITIUS, who have written profeſſedly the Hiſtory of the Bohemian Brethren, ſee LOSCHERI *Hiſtoria Motuum*, part III. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 99.—SALIG. *Hiſt. Confeſſion. Aug.* tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 520.—AD. REGENVOLSCII *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sclavonicæ*, lib. i. cap. xiii, xiv, xv.

United Brethren. In this coalition the reconciled parties ſhewed to each other reciprocal marks of toleration and indulgence; for the external form of the church was modelled after the diſcipline of the *Bohemian Brethren*, and the articles of faith were taken from the creed of the *Calviniſts* [k].

The Waldenſes, Hungarians, and Tranſylvanians.

XXV. The deſcendants of the *Waldenſes*, who lived ſhut up in the vallies of *Piedmont*, were naturally led, by their ſituation in the neighbourhood of the French, and of the Republic of *Geneva*, to embrace the doctrines and rites of the *Reformed* church. So far down, however, as the year 1630, they retained a conſiderable part of their ancient diſcipline and tenets; but the plague, that broke out that year, having deſtroyed the greateſt part of this unhappy people, and among the reſt a conſiderable number of their paſtors and clergy, they addreſſed themſelves to the French churches for ſpiritual ſuccour; and the new doctors, ſent from thence, made ſeveral changes in the diſcipline and doctrine of the Waldenſes, and rendered them conformable, in every reſpect, with thoſe of the proteſtant churches in *France* [l].

The Hungarians and Tranſylvanians were engaged to renounce the errors and ſuperſtitions of the church of *Rome* by the writings of LUTHER, and the miniſtry of his diſciples. But ſome time after MATTHIAS DEVAY, and other doctors, began to introduce, in a ſecret manner, among theſe nations, the doctrines of the Swiſs churches in relation to the euchariſt, as alſo their principles of eccleſiaſtical government. This doctrine, and theſe principles, were propagated in a more open and public manner towards the year 1550, by SZEGEDIN and other Calviniſt teachers, whoſe miniſtry was attended with remarkable ſucceſs. This change was followed by the ſame diſſenſions that had broke out in other countries on like occaſions; and theſe diſſenſions grew into an open ſchiſm among the friends of the Reformation in theſe provinces, which the lapſe of time has rather confirmed than diminiſhed [m].

---

[k] REGENVOLSCIUS, *loc. citat.* lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 120.

[l] LEGER, *Hiſtoire Generale des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, livr. i. chap. xxxiii. p. 205, 206.—ABR. SCULETTI *Annales Renovati Evangelii*, p. 294.—DAN. GERDES, *Hiſt. Renovati Evangelii*, tom. ii. p. 401.

Of the Lutheran churches that embraced Calviniſm.

XXVI. After the ſolemn publication of the famous *Form of Concord*, of which an account has been already given, many German churches, of the Lutheran communion, diſſolved their original bonds, and embraced the doctrine and diſcipline of CALVIN. Among theſe we may place the churches of *Naſſau*, *Hanau*, and *Iſenburg*, with ſeveral others of leſs note. In the year 1595, the princes of *Anhalt*, influenced by the counſels of WOLFGANG AMLINGIUS, renounced alſo the profeſſion of Lutheraniſm, and introduced into their dominions the religious tenets and rites of *Geneva*; this revolution, however, produced a long and warm controverſy between the Lutherans and the inhabitants of the principality [n]. The doctrines of the Calviniſt or Reformed church, more eſpecially thoſe that relate to the euchariſt, were alſo introduced into *Denmark*, towards the concluſion of this century; for, in this kingdom, the diſciples and votaries of MELANCTHON, who had always diſcovered a ſtrong propenſity to a union between the proteſtant churches, were extremely numerous, and they had at their head NICHOLAS HEMMINGIUS, a man eminent for his piety and learning. But the views of this divine, and the ſchemes of his party, being diſcovered much ſooner than they expected, by the vigilant defenders of the Lutheran cauſe, their plans were diſconcerted [*o*], and the progreſs of Calviniſm was ſucceſsfully oppoſed by the Lutheran miniſters, ſeconded by the countenance and authority of the ſovereign [*p*].

---

[m] PAULI DEBREZENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Reform. in Hungar. et Tranſylvan.* lib. ii. p. 64. 72. 98. *Unſchuld. Nachrict.* A. 1738, p. 1076.—GEORG. HANERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Tranſylv.* publiſhed at *Francfort* in 12mo, in the year 1694.

[n] See for an account of this matter the German work of BECHMAN, which is thus entitled *Hiſtoire des Hauſe Anhalt*, vol. ii. p. 133. and that of KRAFT, which bears the title of *Ausferliche Hiſtorie von dem Exorciſmo*, p. 428. 497. ☞ Though the princes profeſſed *Calviniſm*, and introduced Calviniſt miniſters in all the churches, where they had the *right of patronage*, yet the people were left free in their choice; and the noblemen and their vaſſals, that were attached to *Lutheraniſm*, had ſecured to them the unreſtrained exerciſe of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the *Lutherans* were permitted to erect new churches. The *Zerbſt* line, with the greateſt part of its ſubjects, profeſs Lutheraniſm; but the three other lines, with their reſpective territories, are *Calviniſts*.

The diverſity that reigned among the various branches of the Reformed church.

XXVII. It muſt not however be imagined, that the different nations that embraced the communion of the Calviniſt church, adopted, at the ſame time, without exception, all its tenets, rites, and inſtitutions. This univerſal conformity was, indeed, ardently deſired by the Helvetic doctors; but their deſires, in this reſpect, were far from being accompliſhed. The Engliſh, as is ſufficiently known, rejected the forms of eccleſiaſtical government and religious worſhip that were adopted by the other Reformed churches, and could not be perſuaded to receive, as public and national articles of faith, the doctrines that were propagated in *Switzerland*, in relation to the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper and the Divine decrees [q]. The proteſtants in *Holland*, *Bremen*, *Poland*, *Hungary*, and the Palatinate, followed, indeed, the French and Helvetic churches in their ſentiments concerning the euchariſt, in the ſimplicity of their worſhip, and in their principles of eccleſiaſtical polity; but not in their notions of *predeſtination*, which intricate doctrine they left undefined, and ſubmitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual [r]. It may farther be affirmed, that, be-

---

[*o*] ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. iii. p. 57.

☞ [*p*] That is (for our author conſiſtently with truth can mean no more) the deſigns, that were formed to render *Calviniſm* the national and eſtabliſhed religion, proved abortive. It is certain however, that Calviniſm made a very conſiderable progreſs in *Denmark*, and has ſtill a great number of votaries in that kingdom.

☞ [q] It is true indeed, that the doctrine of ZUINGLE, who repreſented the bread and wine as nothing more than the external ſigns of the death of CHRIST, was not adopted by the church of *England*; but the doctrine of CALVIN was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the XXVIIIth article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the Divine Decrees, Dr. MOSHEIM is equally miſtaken. The XVIIth article of the church of *England* is, as Biſhop BURNET candidly acknowledges, framed according to St. AUGUSTIN's doctrine, which ſcarcely differs at all from that of CALVIN; and, though it be expreſſed with a certain latitude that renders it ſuſceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that thoſe who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of Abſolute Decrees. The very cautions, that are ſubjoined to this article, intimate that *Calviniſm* was what it was meant to eſtabliſh. It is certain, that the Calviniſtical doctrine of predeſtination prevailed among the firſt Engliſh Reformers, the greateſt part of whom were, at leaſt, *Sublapſarians*; in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH this doctrine was predominant, but after that period it loſt ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of *England* in the reign of King CHARLES I. Some members of that church ſtill adhered, nevertheleſs, to the tenets of CALVIN, and maintained, not only that the thirty-nine articles were Calviniſtical, but alſo affirmed, that they were not ſuſceptible of being interpreted in that latitude for which the *Arminians* contended. Theſe epiſcopal votaries of Calviniſm were called *Doctrinal Puritans*. See BURNET's *Expoſition of the Seventeenth Article*, &c. and NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 579.

[r] See GROTII *Apologet.*, *eorum, qui Hollandiæ ante mutationem*, A. 1618, *præfuerunt*, cap. iii. p. 54. *Ed. Pariſ.* 1640, in 12mo.

fore the ſynod of *Dort* [*s*], no Reformed church had obliged its members, by any ſpecial law, or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of *Geneva* relating to the primary cauſes of the ſalvation of the elect, or the ruin of the reprobate. It is true indeed, that in the places now mentioned, the greateſt part of the *Reformed* doctors fell by degrees, of their own accord, into the Calviniſtical opinion concerning theſe intricate points; and this was principally owing, no doubt, to the great reputation of the academy of *Geneva*, which was generally frequented, in this century, by thoſe among the Reformed who were candidates for the miniſtry.

The doctrine adopted by the Reformed churches.

XXVIII. The books of the Old and New Teſtament are regarded by the *Reformed* churches as the only ſources of Divine Truth; it muſt however be obſerved, that, to their authority, the church of *England* adds that of the writings of the Fathers during the firſt five centuries [*t*]. The *Reformed* and the *Lutherans* agree in maintaining that the Holy Scriptures are infallible in all things; that, in matters of which the knowledge is neceſſary to ſalvation, they are clear, full, and complete; and alſo that they are to be explained

---

☞ [*s*] It was in this famous ſynod, that was aſſembled in the year 1618, and of which we ſhall have occaſion to give a more ample account in the hiſtory of the following century, that the doctrine of CALVIN was fixed as the national and eſtabliſhed religion of the Seven United Provinces.

☞ [*t*] There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the church of *England*, which implies its conſidering the writings of the Fathers of the firſt five centuries, as an authoritative criterion of religious truth. There is, indeed, a clauſe in the *Act of Uniformity*, paſſed in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH, declaring, that her delegates, in eccleſiaſtical matters, ſhould not determine any thing to be hereſy, but what was adjudged ſo *by the authority of ſcripture, or by the firſt four general councils*; and this has perhaps miſled Dr. MOSHEIM in the paſſage to which this note refers. Much reſpect indeed, and perhaps too much, has been paid to the Fathers; but that has been always a matter of *choice*, and not of *obligation*.

by themſelves, and not either by the dictates of human reaſon, or the deciſions of the ancient Fathers. Several of the doctors among the former have indeed employed too freely the ſagacity of their natural underſtanding, in explaining thoſe divine myſteries that are contained in the Goſpel; and this circumſtance has induced many to imagine, that the *Reformed* adopted two ſources of religion, two criterions of divine truth, *viz.* the *Holy Scripture* and *Human Reaſon*. But perhaps it will be found, that, in this reſpect, doctors of *both* communions have ſometimes gone too far, being led on by the ſpirit of controverſy, and animated with the deſire of victory. For, if we except the ſingular tenets of ſome individuals, it may be affirmed with truth, that the *Lutherans* and the *Reformed* are unanimous in the matter now under conſideration. They both maintain, that *contradictory propoſitions cannot be the objects of faith*; and conſequently that all *doctrines* that contain *ideas* and *notions* that are *repugnant to*, and *mutually deſtroy each other*, muſt be *falſe* and *incredible*. It is true indeed, that the *Reformed* ſometimes uſe this principle in a contentious manner, to overturn certain points of the Lutheran ſyſtem, which they have thought proper to reject [u].

The points in which the Reformed and Lutherans diſagree.

XXIX. The *Reformed*, if by this denomination we underſtand thoſe who embrace the ſentiments of CALVIN, differ entirely from the *Lutherans* in the following points:

1*ſt*, In their notions of the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper. The *Lutherans* affirm that the body

---

☞ [u] Our author has here undoubtedly in view the Lutheran doctrine of *Conſubſtantiation*, which ſuppoſes the ſame *extended body* to be *totally* preſent in different places at one and the ſame time. To call this a groſs and glaring contradiction, ſeems rather the dictate of common ſenſe, than the ſuggeſtion of a contentious ſpirit.

body and blood of CHRIST are *materially preſent* in this ſacrament, though in an incomprehenſible manner; and that they are *really* exhibited both to the righteous and the wicked, to the worthy and to the unworthy, receiver. The *Reformed* hold, on the contrary, that the man CHRIST is only preſent in this ordinance by the external ſigns of bread and wine; though it muſt, at the ſame time, be obſerved, that this matter is differently explained and repreſented in the writings of their doctors.

2*dly*, In their doctrine of the *eternal decrees of God, reſpecting man's ſalvation.* The *Lutherans* maintain, that the *divine decrees* reſpecting the ſalvation or miſery of men are founded upon a *previous knowledge* of their ſentiments and characters; or, in other words, that God, foreſeeing from all eternity the faith or incredulity of different perſons, had reſerved eternal happineſs for the faithful, and eternal miſery for the unbelieving and diſobedient. The *Reformed* entertain different ſentiments concerning this intricate point. They conſider the divine decrees as *free* and *unconditional*, and as founded on the *will of God*, which is limited by no ſuperior order, and which is above all laws.

3*dly*, Concerning *ſome religious rites and inſtitutions*, which the *Reformed* conſider as bordering upon ſuperſtition, or tending, at leaſt, to promote it; while the *Lutherans* view them in another light, and repreſent all of them as *tolerable*, and ſome of them as *uſeful*. Such are the uſe of images in the churches, the diſtinguiſhing veſtments of the clergy, the private confeſſion of ſins, the uſe of wafers in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper, the form of *exorciſm* in the celebration of baptiſm, and other ceremonies of like moment. The *Reformed* doctors inſiſt on the abolition of all theſe rites and inſtitutions; and that upon this general principle, that the diſcipline and worſhip of the Chriſtian church ought to be reſtored to their primitive ſimplicity, and freed from the human inventions and additions that were employed by ſuperſtition in the times of ignorance, to render them more ſtriking to the deluded multitude.

The moment and importance of theſe differences.

XXX. The few heads of difference, between the two communions, which have been now briefly pointed out, have furniſhed an inexhauſtible fund of controverſy to the contending parties, and been drawn out into a multitude of intricate queſtions, and ſubjects of debate, that, by conſequences fairly or injudiciouſly deduced, have widened the ſcene of contention, and extended to almoſt all the important truths of religion. Thus the debate concerning the *manner in which the body and blood of* CHRIST *are preſent in the Euchariſt*, opened to the diſputants a large field of inquiry, in which the nature and fruits of the inſtitutions called *Sacraments*, the majeſty and glory of CHRIST's *humanity*, together with the *communication* of the divine perfections to *it*, and that inward frame of ſpirit that is required in the worſhip that is addreſſed to the divine Saviour, were carefully examined. In like manner, the controverſy, which had for its object *the divine decrees*, led the doctors, by whom it was carried on, into the moſt ſubtile and profound reſearches concerning the nature of the divine attributes, particularly thoſe of *juſtice* and *goodneſs*, the doctrines of *fate* or *neceſſity*, the connexion between *human liberty* and *divine preſcience*, the extent of God's love to mankind, and of the benefits that ariſe from the merits of CHRIST as mediator, the operations of that divine ſpirit or power that rectifies the wills and ſanctifies the affections of men, the perſeverance of the *elect* in their covenant with God, and in a ſtate of ſalvation, and other points of great moment and importance. The ſubject of debate, that was drawn from the *uſe of certain external rites and ceremonies* in religious worſhip, was alſo productive of ſeveral queſtions and enquiries. For beſides the reſearches into the origin and antiquity of certain inſtitutions, to which it gave occaſion, it naturally led to a diſcuſſion of the following important queſtions: *viz. What are the ſpecial marks that characterize things* INDIFFERENT?—*How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adverſary, whoſe oppoſition is only directed againſt things eſteemed indifferent in their own nature?—What is the extent of Chriſtian liberty?—Whether or no it be lawful to retain, in condeſcenſion to the prejudices of the people; or with a view to their benefit, certain ancient rites and inſtitutions, which, although they carry a ſuperſtitious aſpect, may nevertheleſs be ſuſceptible of a favourable and rational interpretation?*

To whom the right of governing the church belongs.

XXXI. It has always been a queſtion much debated among proteſtants, and more eſpecially in *England* and *Holland*, where it has excited great commotions and tumults, *to whom the right of governing the church, and the power of deciding in religious matters, properly belong?* This controverſy has been determined in favour of thoſe who maintain, that the power of deciding, in matters of religious doctrine, diſcipline, and government, is, by the appointment of CHRIST himſelf, veſted in the church, and therefore ought by no means to be intruſted with, or exerciſed by the civil magiſtrate; while, at the ſame time, they grant, that it is the buſineſs of the latter to aſſiſt the church with his protection and advice, to convoke and preſide in its ſynods and councils, to take care that the clergy do not attempt to carry on any thing that may be prejudicial to the intereſts of the ſtate, and, by his authority, to confirm the validity, and ſecure the execution, of the eccleſiaſtical laws enacted by the church under his inſpection. It is true, that from the time of HENRY VIII., the kings of *England* conſider themſelves as *ſupreme heads of the church*, and that in relation to *its ſpiritual, as well as its temporal concerns*; and it is plain enough, that, on the ſtrength of this important title, both HENRY VIII. and his ſon EDWARD aſſumed an extenſive authority and juriſdiction in the church, and looked upon their ſpiritual power, as equal to that which had been unworthily enjoyed by the Roman pontif [*w*]. But Queen ELIZABETH receded conſiderably from theſe high pretenſions, and diminiſhed the ſpiritual power of her ſucceſſors, by declaring that the juriſdiction of the kings of *England* extended only to the miniſters of religion, and not to religion itſelf; to the rulers of the church, and not to the church itſelf; or, in other words, that the perſons of the clergy were alone ſubject to their civil authority [*x*]. Accordingly, we ſee that the conſtitution of the church of *England* reſembles perfectly that of the ſtate, and that there is a ſtriking analogy between the civil and eccleſiaſtical government eſtabliſhed in that country. The clergy, conſiſting of the upper and lower houſes of convocation, are immediately aſſembled by the archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, in conſequence of an order from the ſovereign, and propoſe in theſe meetings, by common conſent, ſuch meaſures as ſeem neceſſary to the well-being of the church; theſe meaſures are laid before the king and parliament, and derive from their approbation and authority the force of laws [y]. But it muſt be acknowledged, that this matter has given occaſion to much altercation and debate; nor has it been found eaſy to fix the extent of the juriſdiction and prerogatives of theſe great bodies in a manner conformable to their reſpective pretenſions, ſince the king and his council explain them in one way, and the clergy, more eſpecially thoſe who are zealous for the ſpiritual ſupremacy and independency of the church, underſtand them in another. The truth of the matter is plainly this, that the eccleſiaſtical polity in *England* has never acquired a ſtable and conſiſtent form, nor been reduced to clear and certain principles. It has rather been carried on and adminiſtered by ancient cuſtom and precedent, than defined and fixed by any regular ſyſtem of laws and inſtitutions.

[*w*] See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 11.

[*x*] See COURAYER, *Supplement aux deux Ouvrages pour le Defenſe de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, chap. xv. p. 486.

☞ This muſt be underſtood with many reſtrictions, if it can be at all admitted. The whole tenor of Queen ELIZABETH's reign ſhewed plainly that ſhe did not pretend to leſs power in religious matters than any of her predeceſſors.

The form of eccleſiaſtical government among the Reformed.

XXXII. If it was not an eaſy matter to determine in what hands the power of deciding affairs of a religious nature was to be lodged, it was no leſs difficult to fix the form of eccleſiaſtical government in which this power was to be adminiſtered. Many vehement diſputes were kindled on this ſubject, which neither the lapſe of time, nor the efforts of human wiſdom, have been able to bring to an amicable iſſue. The Republic of *Geneva*, in conſequence of the counſels of CALVIN, judged it proper that the particular affairs of each church ſhould be directed by a body of elders, or *preſbyters*, all inveſted with an equal degree of power and authority; that matters of a more public and important nature were to be ſub-

---

☞ [y] JO. COSINUS, *De Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ Religione et Diſciplina*, in the learned THOMAS SMITH's *Vitæ Eruditiſſ. Virorum*, publiſhed at *London* in 4to in the year 1707.—See alſo DAV. WILKINS, *De Veteri et Moderna Synodi Anglic. Conſtitutione*, tom. i. *Concil. Magn. Britann.* p. vii.—NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 2, 3. 15. 132.

mitted to the judgment of an aſſembly, or ſynod, compoſed of elders choſen as deputies by the churches of a whole province or diſtrict; and that all affairs of ſuch extenſive influence and high moment, as concerned the welfare of the ſacred community in general, ſhould be examined and decided, as in times of old, by a general aſſembly of the whole church. This form of eccleſiaſtical government the church of *Geneva* adopted for itſelf [z], and left no intreaties or methods of perſuaſion unemployed, that might recommend it to the other Reformed churches with which they lived in fraternal communion. But it was obſtinately

---

☞ [z] The account Dr. MOSHEIM gives here and above (§ XII. of this chapter) of the form of Eccleſiaſtical Government eſtabliſhed by CALVIN at *Geneva*, is far from being accurate. There are but two eccleſiaſtical bodies in that Republick, *viz.* the *Venerable Company* of the paſtors and profeſſors, and the *Conſiſtory*; for a juſt deſcription of which, ſee the judicious Mr. KEATE's *Short Account of the Ancient Hiſtory, preſent Government and Laws of the Republic of Geneva,* printed for *Dodſley* in the year 1761, p. 110. 112. 121. 124.—I would only remark, that what this ſenſible author obſerves, with reſpect to the *Conſiſtory*, p. 124. of his intereſting performance, belongs principally, if not wholly, to the *Venerable Company*.—Dr. MOSHEIM ſeems to have been led into this miſtake, by imagining that the eccleſiaſtical form of Government eſtabliſhed in *Scotland*, where indeed all church affairs are managed by *conſiſtorial*, *provincial*, and *national* aſſemblies, or, in other words, by *preſbyteries*, *ſynods*, and *general ſynods*, was a direct tranſcript of the hierarchy of *Geneva*. It is alſo probable, that he may have been deceived by reading in NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, that the Scottiſh reformers approved of the diſcipline of the Reformed churches of *Geneva* and *Switzerland*, and followed their plan of Eccleſiaſtical Government. But he ought to have obſerved, that this approbation and imitation related only to the *democratical* form of the church of *Geneva*, and the parity of its miniſters. Be that as it may, the plan of government, which our hiſtorian here ſuppoſes to have place at *Geneva*, is in reality that which is obſerved in *Scotland*, and of which no more than the firſt and fundamental principles were taken from the diſcipline of CALVIN. The ſmall territory of *Geneva* would not admit of ſuch a form of eccleſiaſtical polity as Dr. MOSHEIM here deſcribes.

nately rejected by the Engliſh clergy, who regarded as ſacred and immutable that ancient form of ſpiritual government; according to which a certain diſtrict or *dioceſe* is committed to the care and inſpection of one ruler or biſhop, to whom the *preſbyters* of each church are ſubject, as alſo the *deacons* are to the *preſbyters*; while thoſe affairs that concerned the general intereſts of the church are treated in an aſſembly of biſhops, and of ſuch eccleſiaſtics as are next to them in rank and dignity. This form of epiſcopal polity was, with ſome ſmall exceptions, adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian brethren [a], who were become one of the Reformed churches; but it was highly diſpleaſing to thoſe among the proteſtants, who had embraced the ſentiments and diſcipline of CALVIN. The diſſenſions, occaſioned by theſe different ſchemes of eccleſiaſtical polity, were every way adapted to produce a violent ſchiſm in the church; and that ſo much the more, as each of the contending parties pretended to derive their reſpective plan from the injunctions of CHRIST and the practice of his diſciples. And, in effect, it divided the Engliſh nation into two parties, who, during a long time, treated each other with great animoſity and bitterneſs, and whoſe feuds, on many occaſions, proved detrimental to the civil intereſts and proſperity of the nation. This ſchiſm, however, which did ſuch miſchief in *England*, was, by the prudence and piety of a few great and excellent divines, confined to that country, and prevented from either becoming univerſal, or interrupting the fraternal union that prevailed between the church of *England* and the Reformed churches abroad. The worthy men, that thus ſet bounds to the influence of theſe unhappy diviſions, found great oppoſition made, by the ſuggeſtions of bigotry, to their charitable purpoſe. To maintain, however, the bonds of union between the epiſcopal church of *England* and the preſbyterian churches in foreign countries, they laid down the following maxim, which, though it be not univerſally adopted, tends nevertheleſs to the preſervation of external concord among the *Reformed*, *viz.* "That JESUS CHRIST has left upon record no expreſs injunctions with reſpect to the external "form of government, that is to be obſerved in "his church; and conſequently, that every nation hath a right to eſtabliſh ſuch a Form, as "ſeemeth conducive to the intereſts, and ſuitable "to the peculiar ſtate, circumſtances, and exigences of the community, provided that ſuch "an eſtabliſhment be in no reſpect prejudicial "to truth, or favourable to the revival of ſuperſtition [b]."

---

[a] See *Epiſt. de Ordinat. et Succeſſione Epiſcopal. in unitate Fratrum Bohem, conſervata*, in CHRIST. MATTH. PFAFFII *Inſtitution. Juris Eccleſ.* p. 410.

The ſtate of church diſcipline.

XXXIII. It was the opinion of CALVIN, not only that flagitious and profligate members were to be cut off from the ſacred ſociety, and excluded from the communion of the church, but alſo that men of diſſolute and licentious lives were puniſhable by the laws of the ſtate, and the arm of the civil magiſtrate. In this he differed entirely from ZUINGLE, who, ſuppoſing that all authority, of every kind, was lodged in the hands of the magiſtrate alone, would not allow to the miniſters of the church the power of excluding flagitious offenders from its communion, or withholding from them the participation of its ſacraments.

---

[b] See SPANHEMII *Opera*, tom. ii. lib. viii, ix. p. 1055. This was the general opinion of the Britiſh divines that lived in the earlieſt period of the Reformation, and was firſt abandoned by archbiſhop WHITGIFT. See NEAL's *Hiſtory of the Puritans*, tom. iii. p. 140.

ments [c]. But the credit and influence of CALVIN were ſo great at *Geneva*, that he accompliſhed his purpoſe, even in the face of a formidable oppoſition from various quarters. He eſtabliſhed the ſevereſt rules of diſcipline to correct the licentious manners of the times, by which he expoſed himſelf to innumerable perils from the malignity and reſentment of the diſſolute, and to perpetual conteſts with the patrons of voluptuouſneſs and immorality. He executed, moreover, theſe rules of diſcipline with the utmoſt rigour, had them ſtrengthened and ſupported by the authority of the ſtate, excluded obſtinate offenders from the communion of the church, by the judicial ſentence of the *Conſiſtory*, and even went ſo far as to procure their baniſhment from the city; not to mention other kinds of puniſhment, of no mild nature, which, at his deſire, were inflicted upon men of looſe principles and irregular lives [d].

---

[c] See a remarkable letter of RUD. GUALTIERI, in FUESLIN's *Centuria* I. *Epiſtolarum à Reformatoribus Helveticis ſcriptarum*, p. 478. where he expreſſes himſelf thus: *Excommunicationem neque Zuinglius . . . neque Bullingerus umquam probarunt, et . . . obſtiterunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere . . . Baſileæ quidem Oecolampadius, multum diſſuadente Zuinglio, inſtituerat . . . ſed adeo non durabilis fuit illa conſtitutio, ut Oecolampadius illam abrogarit*, &c. See alſo p. 90.

[d] Of all the undertakings of CALVIN, there was none that involved him in ſo much trouble, or expoſed him to ſuch imminent danger, as the plan he had formed, with ſuch reſolution and fortitude, of purging the church by the excluſion of obſtinate and ſcandalous offenders, and inflicting ſevere puniſhments on all ſuch as violated the laws, enacted by the church, or by the *Conſiſtory*, which was its repreſentative. See *The Life of Calvin*, compoſed by BEZA, and prefixed to his letters.—SPON's *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, and particularly the *Notes*, tom. ii. p. 45. 65.—CALVIN's *Letters*, and more eſpecially thoſe addreſſed to *Jaques de Bourgogne*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam*, in 8vo, in the year 1744, p. 126, 127. 132. 153. 157.—The party at *Geneva*, which CALVIN called the ſect of *Libertines* (becauſe they defended the licentious cuſtoms of ancient times, the erection of ſtews, and ſuch like matters, not only by their diſcourſe and their actions, but even by force of arms), was

The clergy in *Switzerland* were highly pleaſed with the form of church-government that had been eſtabliſhed at *Geneva*, and ardently deſirous of a greater degree of power to reſtrain the inſolence of obſtinate ſinners, and a larger ſhare of authority in the church, than they were intruſted with by the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution of ZUINGLE. They *devoutly* wiſhed that the diſcipline of CALVIN might be followed in their *Cantons*, and even made ſome attempts for that purpoſe. But their deſires and their endeavours were equally vain; for the Cantons of *Bern*, *Zurich*, and *Baſil*, diſtinguiſhed themſelves among the others in oppoſing this change, and would by no means permit the bounds, that ZUINGLE had ſet to the juriſdiction of the church, to be removed, nor its power and authority to be augmented, in any reſpect [e].

The ſtate of learning among the Reformed.

XXXIV. All the various branches of learning, whether ſacred or profane, flouriſhed among the Reformed during this century, as appears evidently by the great number of excellent productions which have been tranſmitted to our times. ZUINGLE, indeed, ſeemed diſpoſed to exclude philoſophy from the pale of the church [f]; but in this inconſiderate purpoſe he had few followers, and the ſucceeding doctors of the Helvetic church

---

was both numerous and powerful. But the courage and reſolution of this great reformer gained the aſcendant, and triumphed over the oppoſition of his enemies.

[e] See the account of the tumults and commotions of LAUSANNE, in the *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. ii. p. 119.—The diſputes, that were carried on, upon this occaſion, in the Palatinate, which adopted the eccleſiaſtical diſcipline of *Geneva*, are recorded by ALTINGIUS, in his *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Palat.* and by STRUVIUS, in his *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Palat. German.* p. 212.

[f] ZUINGLE, in the Dedication of his book, *De vera et falſa Religione*, to FRANCIS I. king of *France*, expreſſes himſelf in the following terms; *Philoſophiæ interdictum eſt à Chriſti Scholis: at iſti* (Sorboniſtæ) *fecerunt eam cæleſtis verbi magiſtram.*

were ſoon perſuaded of the neceſſity of philoſophical knowledge, more eſpecially in controverſies and reſearches of a theological kind. Hence it was, that, in the year 1588, an academy was founded at *Geneva* by CALVIN, whoſe firſt care was to place in this new ſeminary a profeſſor of philoſophy for the inſtruction of youth in the principles of reaſoning. It is true, indeed, that this profeſſor had a very limited province aſſigned him, being obliged to confine his inſtructions to a mere interpretation of the precepts of ARISTOTLE, who at this time was the oracle of all the public ſchools [g], and whoſe philoſophical principles and method were excluſively adopted by all the other Reformed academies; though it is certain, that the philoſophy of RAMUS was, for ſome time, preferred by many of the doctors of *Baſil* to that of the Stagirite [h].

The interpreters and commentators of ſcripture.

XXXV. The *Reformed* church, from its very infancy, produced a great number of expoſitors of ſcripture, whoſe learned and excellent commentaries deſerve a memorable place [i] in the hiſtory of theological ſcience. The expoſition that ZUINGLE has given of the greateſt part of the books of the New Teſtament is far from being deſtitute of merit [k]. He was ſucceeded by BULLINGER, OECOLAMPADIUS, and MUSCULUS, and alſo by others, who, though inferior to theſe great men in erudition and genius, deſerve nevertheleſs a certain degree of approbation and eſteem. But the two divines who ſhone with a ſuperior and unrivalled luſtre in this learned liſt of ſacred expoſitors, were JOHN CALVIN, and THEODORE BEZA. The former compoſed an excellent commentary on almoſt all the books of Holy Writ; and the latter publiſhed a Latin Verſion of the *New Teſtament*, enriched with theological and critical obſervations, which has paſſed through many editions, and enjoys, at this day, a conſiderable part of the reputation and applauſe with which it is crowned at its firſt appearance. It muſt be acknowledged, to the honour of the greateſt part of theſe commentators, that, wiſely neglecting thoſe allegorical ſignifications and myſtical meanings that the irregular fancies of former expoſitors had attributed to the terms of Holy Writ, they employed their whole diligence and induſtry in inveſtigating the literal ſenſe, the full energy of the words of ſcripture, in order to find out the true intention of the ſacred writer. It muſt, however, be obſerved, on the other hand, that ſome of theſe interpreters, and more eſpecially CALVIN, have been ſharply cenſured for applying to the temporal ſtate and circumſtances of the Jews, ſeveral prophecies that point to the Meſſiah, and to the Chriſtian diſpenſation in the moſt evident and palpable manner, and thus removing ſome of

---

[g] BEZA, in his *Epiſtolæ Theologicæ*, (ep. xxxvi. p. 156.) ſpeaks thus: *Certum nobis ac conſtitutum eſt, et in ipſis tradendis logicis et in cæteris explicandis diſciplinis ab Ariſtotelis ſententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere.*

[h] See CASP. BRANDTII *Vita Jacobi Arminii*, p. 12, 13. 22.

☞ [i] Dr. MOSHEIM pays a tribute to theſe great men of the Reformed church, that ſeems to be extorted by juſtice, with a kind of effort, from the ſpirit of party. He ſays, that ZUINGLE's labours *are not contemptible*; that CALVIN *attempted an illuſtration of the ſacred writings*; that the *New Teſtament* of BEZA has not, even at this day, *entirely loſt the reputation it formerly enjoyed*. This is faint praiſe; and therefore the tranſlator has, without departing from the tenor of the author's phraſeology, animated a little the coldneſs of his panegyric.

☞ [k] It was not only on the books of the *New Teſtament* that ZUINGLE employed his very learned and excellent labours. He expounded the Book of *Geneſis*, together with the twenty-four firſt chapters of *Exodus*, and gave new Verſions of the *Book of Pſalms*, of the Prophecies of *Iſaiah* and *Jeremiah*.

the moſt ſtriking arguments in favour of the divinity of the Goſpel [l].

The theological doctrine of the Reformed Church.

XXXVI. The ſtate of theology, and the revolutions it underwent among the Helvetic and the other Reformed churches, were pretty much the ſame with what it met with among the Lutherans. ZUINGLE was one of the firſt Reformed doctors who reduced that ſacred ſcience into a certain ſort of order, in his book *Concerning true and falſe Religion*, which contained a brief expoſition of the principal doctrines of Chriſtianity. This production was followed by one much more comprehenſive in its contents, and perfect in its kind, compoſed by CALVIN, and entitled, *Inſtitutes of the Chriſtian Religion*, which held in the Reformed churches the ſame rank, authority, and credit, that the *Loci Communes* of MELANCTHON obtained among us [m]. The example of CALVIN animated the doctors of his communion, and produced a great number of writers of *Common Place Divinity*, ſome more, others leſs voluminous, among which MUSCULUS, PETER MARTYR, and PISCATOR particularly excelled. The moſt ancient of theſe writers are, generally ſpeaking, the beſt, on account of their ſimplicity and clearneſs, being untainted with that affectation of ſubtilty, and that ſcholaſtic ſpirit, that have eclipſed the merit of many a good genius. CALVIN was a model in this reſpect, more eſpecially in his *Inſtitutes*; a work remarkable for the fineſt elegance of ſtyle, and the greateſt eaſe and perſpicuity of expreſſion, together with the moſt perfect ſimplicity of method, and clearneſs of argument. But this ſimplicity was ſoon effaced by the intricate ſcience of the ſchools. The philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, which was taught in almoſt all the ſeminaries of learning, and ſuffered much from falling into bad hands, inſinuated itſelf into the regions of theology, and rendered them barren, thorny, intricate, and gloomy, by the enormous multitude of barbarous terms, captious queſtions, minute diſtinctions, and uſeleſs ſubtilties, that followed in its train [n].

---

[l] See ÆGIDII HUNNII *Calvinus Judaizans*, publiſhed at *Wittemberg*, in 8vo. in the year 1595, which was refuted by DAVID PAREUS, in a book publiſhed the ſame year under the title of *Calvinus Orthodoxus*.

☞ [m] The reader muſt not forget that the learned author of this Hiſtory is a Lutheran.

XXXVII. The

---

[n] It muſt however be acknowledged, that the *ſcholaſtic* method of teaching theology ſeems to have firſt infected our [the Lutheran] church, though the contagion ſpread itſelf, ſoon after, among the reformed doctors. It was certainly very recent in *Holland* at the time of the famous ſynod of *Dort*. In this aſſembly MACCOVIUS, profeſſor at *Franeker*, a man deeply verſed in all the myſteries of the ſcholaſtic philoſophy, was accuſed of hereſy by his colleague SIBRAND LUBBERT. When the matter was examined, the ſynod gave it as their opinion, that MACCOVIUS was unjuſtly accuſed of hereſy; but that, in his divinity lectures, he had not followed that ſimplicity of method, and clearneſs of expreſſion, that are commendable in a public teacher of Chriſtianity; and that he rather followed the ſubtile manner of the ſcholaſtic doctors, than the plain and unaffected phraſeology of the inſpired writers. The deciſion of the ſynod is expreſſed by WALTER BALCANQUAL (in the acts of that eccleſiaſtical aſſembly that are ſubjoined to his letters to Sir DUDLEY CARLETON) in the following words: *Maccovium . . . nullius hæreſeos reum teneri . . . peccaſſe eum, quod quibuſdam ambiguis et obſcuris ſcholaſticis phraſibus uſus ſit:* QUOD SCHOLASTICUM DOCENDI MODUM CONETUR IN BELGICIS ACADEMIIS INTRODUCERE . . . *Monendum eſſe eum, ut cum ſpiritu ſancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio* *. Theſe admonitions produced but little effect on MACCOVIUS, as appears by his theological writings, which are richly ſeaſoned with ſcholaſtic wit and intricate ſpeculations. He therefore appears to have been the firſt who introduced the ſubtilties of philoſophy into the theological ſyſtem of the Reformed churches in *Holland*. He was not, however, alone in this attempt, but was ſeconded by the accute Mr. WILLIAM AMES, miniſter of the Engliſh church at the *Hague*, and ſeveral others of the ſame ſcholaſtic turn. This method of teaching theology muſt have been in uſe among almoſt all the Reformed doctors before the ſynod of *Dort*, if we give credit to EPISCOPIUS, who, in the laſt diſcourſe he

* See the *Acta Synodi Dord.* in HALE's *Golden Remains*. p. 161.—& PHILIPPI LIMBORCHII *Epiſtolar. Eccleſiaſticar. Collect.* p. 574.

addreſſed

The ſtate of practical divinity or morality.

XXXVII. The Reformed doctors of this century generally concluded their treatiſes of didactic theology with a delineation of the moral duties that are incumbent upon Chriſtians, and the rules of practice that are preſcribed in the Goſpel. This method was obſerved by CALVIN, and was followed, out of reſpect for his example, by almoſt all the divines of his communion, who looked upon him as their model and their guide. This eminent man, towards the concluſion of his *Inſtitutes*, ſpeaks of the power of the magiſtrate, and the ends of civil government; and in the laſt chapter gives the portraiture of the *life and manners of a true Chriſtian*, but in a much more conciſe manner than the copiouſneſs, dignity, and importance of the ſubject ſeemed to require. The progreſs of morality among the Reformed, was obſtructed by the very ſame means that retarded its improvement among the Lutherans. It was neglected amidſt the tumult of controverſy; and while every pen was drawn to maintain certain *ſyſtems of doctrine*, few were employed in cultivating or promoting that nobleſt of all ſciences, which has *virtue*, *life*, and *manners* for its objects.

addreſſed to his diſciples at *Leyden*, tells them that he had carefully avoided this ſcholaſtic divinity; and that this was the principal cauſe that had drawn on him the vehement hatred and oppoſition of all the other profeſſors and teachers of theology. His words are as follow: *Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipſa ſcriptura ſacra, elaboratis humana induſtria phraſibus, ingenioſis vocularum fictionibus, locorum communium, artificioſis texturis, exquiſitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus adeo involutam, perplexam et intricatam redditam eſſe, ut Oedipo ſæpe opus eſſet ad Sphingem illam theologicam enodandam. Ita eſt, ut hinc primæ lacrymæ—Reducendam itaque terminorum apoſtolicorum et cuivis obviorum ſimplicitatem ſemper ſequendam putavi, et ſequeſtrandas, quas academiæ et ſcholæ tanquam proprias ſibi vendicant, logicas, philoſophicaſque ſpeculationes et dictiones.* See PHILIPPI LIMBORCHII *Vita Epiſcopii*, p. 123, 124.

This maſter-ſcience, which Calvin and his aſſociates had left in a rude and imperfect ſtate, was firſt reduced into ſome kind of form, and explained with a certain degree of accuracy and preciſion, by William Perkins [*o*], an Engliſh divine, as the Reformed doctors univerſally allow. He was ſeconded in this laudable undertaking by Telingius, a native of *Holland*, whoſe writings were compoſed in the Dutch language. It was by a worthy and pious ſpirit of emulation, excited by the example of theſe two doctors, that William Ames, a native of *Scotland*, and profeſſor of divinity at *Franeker* [*p*], was engaged to compoſe a complete Body of Chriſtian Morality [*q*]. Theſe writers

---

☞ [*o*] Mr. William Perkins was born at *Marſton* in *Warwickſhire*, in the firſt year of Queen Elizabeth, and educated in *Chriſt's* College, *Cambridge*, of which he was Fellow. He was one of the moſt famous practical writers and preachers of his age. His puritanical and non-conforming principles expoſed him to the cognizance of the *High Commiſſion Court*; but his peaceable behaviour, and eminent reputation, in the learned world, procured him an exemption from the perſecutions that fell upon his brethren. His works, which were printed in three volumes, folio, afford abundant proofs of his piety and induſtry, eſpecially when it is conſidered that he died in the 44th year of his age.

☞ [*p*] Dr. William Ames, educated at *Cambridge*, under Mr. Perkins, fled from the perſecution of Archbiſhop Bancroft, and was invited by the ſtates of *Frieſland* to the divinity chair in the Univerſity of *Franeker*, which he filled with great reputation during the ſpace of twelve years, after which he removed to *Rotterdam*, at the invitation of an *Engliſh* church there, and became their paſtor. He was at the ſynod of *Dort*, and informed King James's ambaſſador at the *Hague*, from time to time, of the debates of that aſſembly. Beſides his controverſial writings againſt the Arminians, he publiſhed the following: *Medulla Theologiæ* (the work here referred to by Dr. Mosheim); *Manuductio Logica*;—*Caſes of Conſcience*; *Analyſis on the Book of Pſalms*;—*Notes on the Firſt and Second Epiſtles of St. Peter*, &c. Theſe productions are not void of merit, conſidering the times in which they were written.

☞ [*q*] In the Dedication and Preface of his famous book *De Conſcientia et ejus jure*, Dr. Ames obſerves (*Præfat.* p. 3.) that writers were ſucceeded by others, who ſtill threw farther light on this important ſcience.

The conteſts of Calvin with the Spiritual Libertines.

XXXVIII. The Reformed church was leſs diſturbed, during this century, by ſects, diviſions, and theological diſputes, than the Lutheran, which was often a prey to the moſt unhappy diſſenſions. This circumſtance is looked upon by the former as a matter of triumph, though it may be very eaſily accounted for by all ſuch as are acquainted with the Hiſtory of the Reformed Church [r]. We have, however, in the writings of CALVIN, an account, and alſo a refutation, of a moſt pernicious ſect that ſprung up in that church, and produced troubles of a more deplorable kind than any that happened in our community [s]. This odious ſect, which aſſumed the denominations of *Libertines* and *Spiritual Brethren and Siſters*, aroſe in *Flanders*, was headed by POCKESIUS, RUFFUS, and QUINTIN, got a certain footing in *France* through the favour and protection of MARGARET, queen of *Navarre*, and ſiſter to FRANCIS I., and found patrons in ſeveral of the

---

that an exceſſive zeal for *doctrine* had produced an unhappy neglect of *morality*, *Quod hæc pars prophetiæ* (i. e. morality) *hactenus minus fuerit exculta, hoc inde fuit, quod primipilares noſtri perpetuo in acie adverſus hoſtes pugnare, fidem propugnare, et aream eccleſiæ purgare, neceſſitate quadam cogebantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, ſicut bello fervente uſu venire ſolet*. The addreſs to the ſtudents of *Francker*, which is ſubjoined to this book, under the title of *Parænesis ad Studioſos*, &c. deſerves to be peruſed, as it confirms farther what has been already obſerved with reſpect to the neglect of the ſcience of morality. *Theologi*, ſays he, *præclare ſe inſtructos putant ad omnes officii ſui partes*, ſi dogmata tantum intelligant. —*Neque tamen omnia dogmata ſcrutantur, ſed illa ſola, quæ præcipue ſolent agitari et in controverſiam vocari*.

☞ [r] Dr. MOSHEIM ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the ſuſpicion of having been ſomewhat at a loſs for a *favourable* ſolution.

☞ [s] Why all theſe compariſons? Our author ſeems, on ſome occaſions, to tinge his hiſtorical relation with the ſpirit of party.

Reformed churches [t]. Their doctrine, as far as it can be known by the writings of CALVIN and its other antagoniſts (for theſe fanatics publiſhed no account of their tenets that is come to my knowledge), amounted to the following propoſitions: " That the Deity was the ſole *operating* " *cauſe* in the mind of man, and the immediate " *author* of all human actions; that, conſequently, " the diſtinctions of *good* and *evil*, that had been " eſtabliſhed with reſpect to theſe actions, were " falſe and groundleſs, and that men could not, " properly ſpeaking, commit ſin; that religion " conſiſted in the union of the ſpirit, or rational " ſoul, with the Supreme Being; that all thoſe " who had attained this happy union, by ſublime " contemplation and elevation of mind, were " then allowed to indulge, without exception or " reſtraint, their appetites and paſſions; that all " their actions and purſuits were then perfectly " innocent; and that, after the death of the body, " they were to be united to the Deity." Theſe extravagant tenets reſemble, in ſuch a ſtriking manner, the opinions of the *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, that it appears to me, beyond all doubt, that the *Libertines*, or *Spirituals*, now under conſideration, were no more than a remnant of that ancient ſect. The place of their origin confirms this hypotheſis; ſince it is well known, that, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, *Flanders* almoſt ſwarmed with licentious fanatics of this kind.

And with the Libertines of Geneva.

XXXIX. We muſt not confound, as is frequently done, with theſe fanatics, another kind of *Libertines*, whom CALVIN had to combat, and who gave him much trouble and perplexity during the whole courſe of his life and miniſtry, I mean the *Libertines of Geneva.* Theſe were rather a cabal of rakes than a ſect of fanatics. For they made no pretences to any religious ſyſtem, but pleaded only for the liberty of leading voluptuous and immoral lives. This cabal was compoſed of a certain number of licentious citizens, who could not bear the ſevere diſcipline of CALVIN, who puniſhed with rigour not only diſſolute manners, but alſo whatever carried the aſpect of irreligion and impiety. This irregular troop ſtood forth in defence of the licentiouſneſs and diſſipation that had reigned in their city before the Reformation, pleaded for the continuance of thoſe brothels, banquetings, and other entertainments of a ſenſual kind, which the regulations of CALVIN were deſigned to aboliſh, and employed all the bitterneſs of reproach and invective, all the reſources of fraud and violence, all the powers of faction, to accompliſh their purpoſe [*u*]. In this turbulent cabal there were ſeveral perſons, who were not only notorious for their diſſolute and ſcandalous manner of living, but alſo for their atheiſtical impiety and contempt of all religion. Of this odious claſs was GRUET, who attacked CALVIN with the utmoſt animoſity and fury, calling him biſhop *Aſculanenſis*, the new pope, and branding him with other contumelious denominations of a like nature. This GRUET denied the divinity of the Chriſtian religion, the immortality of the ſoul, the difference between moral good and evil, and rejected, with diſdain, the doctrines that are held the moſt ſacred among Chriſtians; for which impieties he was at laſt brought before the civil tribunals, in the year 1550, and was condemned to death [*w*]

---

[t] See CALVINI *Inſtructio adverſus fanaticum et furioſam ſectam Libertinorum, qui ſe ſpirituales vocant*, in *Tractatibus ejus Theologicis*.

[*u*] SPON's *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 44. in the Notes of the editor, in the edition in 12mo publiſhed at *Geneva in* 1730.

[*w*] Id. tom. ii. p. 47. in the Notes.

Calvin's diſputes with Caſtalio;

XL. The oppoſition that was made to CALVIN did not end here. He had conteſts of another kind to ſuſtain againſt thoſe who could not reliſh his theological ſyſtem, and, more eſpecially, his melancholy and diſcouraging doctrine in relation to *eternal* and *abſolute Decrees*. Theſe adverſaries felt, by a diſagreeable experience, the warmth and violence of his haughty temper, and that impatience of contradiction that aroſe from an over-jealous concern for his honour, or rather for his unrivalled ſupremacy. He would not ſuffer them to remain at *Geneva*; nay, in the heat of the controverſy, being carried away by the impetuoſity of his paſſions, he accuſed them of crimes, from which they have been fully abſolved by the impartial judgment of unprejudiced poſterity [x]. Among theſe victims of CALVIN's unlimited power and exceſſive zeal, we may reckon SEBASTIAN CASTALIO, maſter of the public ſchool at *Geneva*, who, though not exempt from failings [y], was nevertheleſs a man of probity, and was alſo remarkable for the extent of his learning, and the elegance of his taſte. As this learned man could not approve of all the meaſures that were followed, nor indeed of all the opinions that were entertained by CALVIN and his colleagues, and particularly that of abſolute and unconditional predeſtination, he was depoſed from his office in the year 1544, and baniſhed the city. The magiſtrates of *Baſil* received, nevertheleſs, this ingenious exile, and gave him the Greek profeſſorſhip in their univerſity [z].

---

[x] At this day, we may venture to ſpeak thus freely of the raſh deciſions of CALVIN, ſince even the Doctors of *Geneva*, as well as thoſe of the other Reformed churches, ingenuouſly acknowledge, that the eminent talents and excellent qualities of that great man were accompanied with great defects, for which, however, they plead indulgence, in conſideration of his ſervices and virtues. See the *Notes* to SPON's *Hiſtoire de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 110. as alſo the *Preface* to CALVIN's *Letters to Jaques de Bourgogne*, p. 19.

☞ [y] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article CASTALIO, in which the merit and demerit of that learned man ſeem to be impartially and accurately examined.

with Bolſec,

XLI. A like fate happened to JEROM BOLSEC, a French monk of the Carmelite order, who, though much inferior to CASTALIO in genius and learning, was nevertheleſs judged worthy of eſteem; on account of the motive that brought him to *Geneva*; for it was a conviction of the excellence of the proteſtant religion that engaged him to abandon the monaſtic retreats of ſuperſtition, and to repair to this city, where he followed the profeſſion of phyſic. His imprudence, however, was great, and was the principal cauſe of the misfortunes that befel him. It led him, in the year 1551, to lift up his voice in the full congregation, after the concluſion of divine worſhip, and to declaim, in the moſt indecent manner, againſt the doctrine of *abſolute Decrees*; for which he was caſt into priſon, and, ſoon after, ſent into baniſhment. He then returned to the place of his nativity, and to the communion of *Rome*, and publiſhed the moſt bitter and ſlanderous libels, in which the reputation, conduct, and morals of CALVIN and BEZA were cruelly attacked [a]. From this treatment of BOLSEC aroſe the miſunderſtanding between CALVIN and JAQUES DE BOURGOGNE, a man illuſtrious by his deſcent from the dukes of *Burgundy*, who was CALVIN's great patron and intimate friend, and who had ſettled at *Geneva* with no other view than to enjoy the pleaſure of converſing with him. JAQUES DE BOURGOGNE had employed BOLSEC as his phyſician, and was ſo well ſatisfied with his ſervices, that he endeavoured to ſupport him, and to prevent his being ruined by the enmity and authority of CALVIN. This incenſed the latter to ſuch a degree, that he turned the force of his reſentment againſt this illuſtrious nobleman, who, to avoid his vengeance, removed from *Geneva*, and paſſed the remainder of his days in a rural retreat [*b*].

---

[z] See UYTENBOGARD's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* written in Dutch, part II. p. 70—73. where that author endeavours to defend the innocence of CASTALIO. See alſo COLOMESII *Italia Orientalis*, p. 99.—BAYLE's *Dict.* tom. i. p. 792.

[a] See BAYLE's *Diction.* at the article BOLSEC.—SPON's *Hiſt. de Geneve*, tom. ii. p. 55. in the *Notes*.—*Biblioth. Raiſonnée*, tom. xxxii. p. 446. tom. xxxiv. p. 409.

and with Ochinus.

XLII. BERNARDIN OCHINUS, a native of *Siena*, and, before his converſion, general of the order of Capuchins, was, in the year 1543, baniſhed from *Switzerland*, in conſequence of a ſentence paſſed upon him by the Helvetic church. This proſelyte, who was a man of a fertile imagination, and a lively and ſubtile turn of mind, had been invited to *Zurich* as paſtor of the Italian church eſtabliſhed in that city. But the freedom, or rather the licentiouſneſs, of his ſentiments, expoſed him juſtly to the diſpleaſure of thoſe who had been his patrons and protectors. For, among many other opinions very different from thoſe that were commonly received, he maintained that the law, which confined a huſband to one wife, was ſuſceptible of exceptions in certain caſes. In his writings alſo he propagated ſeveral notions, that were repugnant to the theological ſyſtem of the Helvetic doctors, and puſhed his inquiries into many ſubjects of importance, with a boldneſs and freedom that were by no means ſuitable to the genius and ſpirit of the age in which he lived. Some have, however, undertaken his defence, and have alleged in his behalf, that the errors he maintained at the time of his baniſhment (when,

---

[*b*] See *Lettres de* CALVIN *à Jaques de Bourgogne*, Preface, p. 8.—*La Bibliotheque Raiſonnée*, tom. xxxiv. p. 444. tom. xxxiv. p. 406.

worn

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART II.

worn out with age, and oppreſſed with poverty, he was rather an object of compaſſion, than of reſentment), were not of ſuch a heinous nature as to juſtify ſo ſevere a puniſhment. However that may have been, this unfortunate exile retired into *Poland*, where he embraced the communion of the Anti-trinitarians and Anabaptiſts [c], and ended his days in the year 1564 [d].

The controverſy between the church of *England* and the *Puritans*.

XLIII. It is remarkable enough, that thoſe very doctors, who animadverted with ſuch ſeverity upon all thoſe who dared to diſſent from any part of their theological ſyſtem, thought proper, nevertheleſs, to behave with the greateſt circumſpection, and the moſt pacific ſpirit of mildneſs, in the long controverſy that was carried on with ſuch animoſity between the *Puritans*, and the abettors of *epiſcopacy* in *England*. For if, on the one hand, they could not but ſtand well affected to the *Puritans*, who were ſtedfaſt defenders of the diſcipline and ſentiments of the Helvetic church; ſo, on the other, they were connected with the epiſcopal doctors by the bonds of Chriſtian communion and fraternal love. In this critical ſituation, their whole thoughts were turned towards reconciliation and peace; and they exhorted their brethren, the *Puritans*, to put on a ſpirit of meekneſs and forbearance towards the epiſcopal church, and not to break the bonds of charity and communion with its rulers or its members. Such was the gentle ſpirit of the doctors in *Switzerland* towards the church of *England*, notwithſtanding the ſevere treatment the greateſt part of the *Reformed* had received from that church, which conſtantly inſiſted on the divine origin of its government and diſcipline, and ſcarcely allowed the other reformed communities the privileges, or even the denomination, of a true church. This moderation of the Helvetic doctors was the dictate of prudence. They did not think it expedient to contend with a generous and flouriſhing people, nor to incur the diſpleaſure of a mighty queen, whoſe authority ſeemed to extend not only to her own dominions, but even to the United Provinces, which were placed in her neighbourhood, and, in ſome meaſure, under her protection. Nor did the apprehenſions of a general ſchiſm in the Reformed church contribute a little to render them meek, moderate, and pacific. It is one thing to puniſh and excommunicate a handful of weak and unſupported individuals, who attempt to diſturb the tranquillity of the ſtate by the introduction of opinions, which, though neither highly abſurd, nor of dangerous conſequence, have yet the demerit of novelty; and another to irritate, or promote diviſions in a flouriſhing church, which, though weakened

---

[c] BOVERII *Annales Capucinorum.*—Together with a book, entitled, *La guerre Seraphique, ou Hiſtoire des perils qu'a couru la barbe des Capuchins*, livr. ii. p. 147. livr. iii. p. 190. 230.—*Obſervationes Halenſes Latinæ*, tom. iv. *Obſerv.* xx. p. 406. tom. v. *Obſerv.* i. p. 3.—BAYLE's *Diction.* at the article OCHIN.—CHRIST. SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 4. NICERON, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire des hommes illuſtres*, tom. xix. p. 166.

☞ [d] OCHINUS did not leave the accuſations of his adverſaries without a reply; he publiſhed, in Italian, *Five Books of Apology* for his character and conduct, which were printed, together with a Latin tranſlation of them, by SEB. CASTALIO, without the date of the year. The *Geneva* edition of this apology bears date 1554, and is in 8vo. There is a German edition in 4to, publiſhed (according to VOGTIUS, *Catal. Lib. rar.* p. 430.) in the year 1556. That copy in the *Jena* library bears date 1559. See MYLIUS's *Memor. Acad. Jenenſ.* C. 6. p. 432. BEZA, in his letter to DUDITHIUS, inſults the memory of OCHINUS, and pretends to juſtify the ſeverity with which he was treated, in ſuch a taunting and uncharitable manner, as does him little credit. See his *Epiſt. Theolog. Genevæ*, 1575, in 12mo. Epiſt. 1. p. 10. & Ep. 81. What the writers of the Romiſh church have laid to the charge of OCHINUS, may be ſeen in the life of Cardinal COMMENDONI, written by GRATIANI biſhop of *Amelia* (and publiſhed in a French tranſlation by the eloquent FLECHIER biſhop of *Niſmes*), B. 2. C. 9. p. 138—149. N.

more

more or leſs by inteſtine feuds, is yet both powerful and reſpectable in a high degree. Beſides, the diſpute between the church of *England* and the other Reformed churches did not, as yet, turn upon points of doctrine, but only on the rites of external worſhip and the form of eccleſiaſtical government. It is, however, to be obſerved, that in proceſs of time, nay ſoon after the period now under conſideration, certain religious doctrines were introduced into the debate between the two churches, that contributed much to widen the breach, and to caſt the proſpect of reconciliation at a diſtance [*d*].

Many perſons of eminent genius and learning among the Reformed.

XLIV. That the Reformed church abounded, during this century, with great and eminent men, juſtly celebrated for their illuſtrious talents and univerſal learning, is too well known to ſtand in need of any proof. Beſides CALVIN, ZUINGLE, and BEZA, who exhibited to the Republic of Letters very ſtriking inſtances of genius and erudition, we may place in the liſt of thoſe who have gained an immortal name by their writings, OECOLAMPADIUS, BULLINGER, FAREL, VIRET, MARTYR, BIBLIANDER, MUSCULUS, PELLICAN, LAVATER, HOSPINIAN, URSINUS, CRANMER archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, SZEGEDINUS, and many

---

☞ [*d*] All the proteſtant divines of the *Reformed* church, whether Puritans or others, ſeemed indeed, hitherto, of one mind about the *Doctrines of Faith*. But, towards the latter end of queen ELIZABETH's reign, there aroſe a party, which were firſt for ſoftening, and then for overthrowing, the received opinions concerning *Predeſtination*, *Perſeverance*, *Free-will*, *Effectual Grace*, and the *Extent of Chriſt's Redemption*. Theſe are the doctrines to which Dr. MOSHEIM alludes in this paſſage. The clergy of the epiſcopal church began to lean towards the notions concerning theſe intricate points, which ARMINIUS propagated ſome time after this; while, on the other hand, the Puritans adhered rigorouſly to the ſyſtem of CALVIN. Several epiſcopal doctors remained attached to the ſame ſyſtem, and all theſe abettors of Calviniſm, whether epiſcopal or preſbyterian, were called *Doctrinal Puritans*.

others, whoſe names and merits are recorded by the writers of philological hiſtory, and particularly by MELCHIOR ADAM, ANTONY WOOD, and DANIEL NEAL, the learned and induſtrious author of the *Hiſtory of the Puritans.*

CHAP. III.

The Hiſtory of the ANABAPTISTS *or* MENNONITES.

The origin of the Anabaptiſts obſcure.

I. THE true origin of that ſect which acquired the denomination of the *Anabaptiſts* [e] by their adminiſtering anew the rite of baptiſm to thoſe who came over to their communion; and derived that of *Mennonites*, from the famous

---

[e] The modern *Mennonites* reject the denomination of *Anabaptiſts*, and alſo diſavow the cuſtom of repeating the ceremony of baptiſm, from whence this denomination is derived. They acknowledge that the ancient *Anabaptiſts* practiſed the repetition of baptiſm to thoſe who joined them from other Chriſtian churches; but they maintain, at the ſame time, that this cuſtom is at preſent aboliſhed by far the greateſt part of their community. (See HERM. SCHYN, *Hiſtoriæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, cap. ii. p. 32.). But here, if I am not much miſtaken, theſe good men forget that ingenuous candour and ſimplicity, of which, on other occaſions, they make ſuch oſtentation, and have recourſe to artifice in order to diſguiſe the true cauſe and origin of the denomination in queſtion. They pretend, for inſtance, that the *Anabaptiſts*, their anceſtors, were ſo called from their baptiſing *a ſecond time* all adult perſons, who left other churches to enter into their communion. But it is certain, that the denomination in queſtion was given them not only on this account, but alſo, and indeed principally, from the following conſideration; that they did not look upon thoſe who had been baptiſed in a ſtate of infancy, or at a tender age, as rendered, by the adminiſtration of this ſacrament, true members of the Chriſtian church; and therefore inſiſted upon their being re-baptiſed in order to their being received into the communion of the *Anabaptiſts*. It is likewiſe certain, that all the churches of that communion, however they may vary in other reſpects, and differ from each other in their tenets and practices, agree nevertheleſs in this opinion, and, as yet, perſevere obſtinately in it. In a more eſpecial manner are the ancient *Flemiſh Anabaptiſts* entitled to this

---

this denomination. For they not only re-baptiſe the children that have been already baptiſed in other churches, but even obſerve the ſame method with reſpect to perſons that are come to the years of reaſon and diſcretion. Nay, what is ſtill more remarkable, the different ſects of *Anabaptiſts* deal in the ſame manner one with another; each ſect re-baptiſes the perſons that enter into its communion, although they have already received that ſacrament in another ſect of the ſame denomination; and the reaſon of this conduct is, that each ſect conſiders its *baptiſm alone* as pure and valid. It is indeed to be obſerved, that there is another claſs of *Anabaptiſts*, called *Waterlandians*, who are more moderate in their principles, and wiſer in all reſpects than thoſe now mentioned, and who do not pretend to re-baptiſe *adult* perſons, who have already been baptiſed in other Chriſtian churches, or in other ſects of their own denomination. This moderate claſs are, however, with propriety, termed *Anabaptiſts*, on account of their re-baptiſing ſuch as had received the Baptiſmal Rite in a ſtate of infancy or childhood. The patrons of this ſect ſeem, indeed, very ſtudious to conceal a practice, which they cannot deny to take place among them; and their eagerneſs to conceal it, ariſes from an apprehenſion of reviving the hatred and ſeverities which formerly purſued them. They are afraid, leſt, by acknowledging the truth, the modern *Mennonites* ſhould be conſidered as the deſcendants of thoſe flagitious and fanatical *Anabaptiſts* of *Munſter*, whoſe enormities rendered their very name odious to all true Chriſtians. All this appears evident from the following paſſage in SCHYN's *Hiſtoriæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, tom. ii. p. 32. where that author pretends to prove, that his brethren are unjuſtly *ſtigmatized* with the odious denomination of *Anabaptiſts*. His words are: *Anabaptiſmus ille plane obſolevit et a multis retro annis neminem cujuſcunque ſectæ Chriſtianæ fidei,* JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI *baptizatum, dum ad noſtras Eccleſias tranſire cupit, re-baptizaverunt,* i. e. *That ſpecies of Anabaptiſm, with which we are charged, exiſts no longer, nor has it happened, during the ſpace of many years paſt, that any perſon profeſſing Chriſtianity, of whatever church or ſect he may have been, and who had been previouſly baptiſed* ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST, *has been re-baptiſed upon his entering into our communion.* This paſſage would, at firſt ſight, induce an inattentive reader to imagine, that there is no ſuch thing among the modern Mennonites, as the cuſtom of re-baptiſing thoſe who enter into their community. But the words which we have marked in capitals (JUXTA MANDATUM CHRISTI, famous man, to whom they owe the greateſt part of their preſent felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, of conſequence, extremely difficult to be aſcertained [*f*]. This uncer-

---

CHRISTI, i. e. ACCORDING TO THE COMMANDMENT OF CHRIST) diſcovers ſufficiently the artifice and fraud that lie hid in this apology; for the Anabaptiſts maintain, that there is *no commandment of Chriſt* in favour of infant baptiſm. Moreover, we ſee the whole fallacy expoſed by what the author adds to the ſentence already quoted: *Sed illum etiam* ADULTORUM *baptiſmum ut ſufficientem agnoſcunt.* Nevertheleſs, this author, as if he had perfectly proved his point, concludes, with an air of triumph, that the odious name of *Anabaptiſts* cannot be given, with any propriety, to the *Mennonites* at this day; *Quare,* ſays he, *veriſſimum eſt, illud odioſum nomen Anabaptiſtarum illis non convenire.* In this, however, he is certainly miſtaken; and the name in queſtion is juſt as applicable to the modern *Mennonites,* as it was to the ſect from which they deſcend, ſince the beſt and wiſeſt of the *Mennonites* maintain, in conformity with the principles of the ancient Anabaptiſts, that the baptiſm of infants is deſtitute of validity, and conſequently are very careful in re-baptiſing their proſelytes, notwithſtanding their having been baptized, in their tender years, in other Chriſtian churches. Many circumſtances perſuade me, that the *declarations* and repreſentations of things given by the modern *Mennonites,* are not always worthy of credit. Unhappily inſtructed by the miſeries and calamities in which their anceſtors were involved, they are anxiouſly careful to conceal entirely thoſe tenets and laws that are the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of their ſect; while they embelliſh what they cannot totally conceal, and diſguiſe with the greateſt art ſuch of their inſtitutions, as otherwiſe might appear of a pernicious tendency, and might expoſe them to cenſure.

[*f*] The writers for and againſt the *Anabaptiſts* are amply enumerated by CASPER SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introductio ad Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* tom. i. p. 826. & CHRIST. M. PFAFFIUS, in his *Introduct. in Hiſtor. Literar. Theologiæ,* part II. p. 349.—Add to theſe a modern writer, and a Mennonite preacher, HERMAN SCHYN, who publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 8vo, in the year 1729, his *Hiſtoria Mennonitar.* and, in 1729, his *Plenior Deductio Hiſtor. Mennonit.* Theſe two books, though they do not deſerve the title of a *Hiſtory of the Mennonites,* are nevertheleſs uſeful, in order to come at a thorough knowledge of the affairs of this ſect; for this author is much more intent upon defending his brethren againſt the accuſations and reproaches with which they have been loaded, than careful in tracing out

the

uncertainty will not appear ſurpriſing, when it is conſidered, that this ſect ſtarted up, all of a ſudden, in ſeveral countries, at the ſame point of time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the firſt conteſts of the Reformers with the Roman pontifs drew the attention of the world, and employed the pens of the learned, in ſuch a manner, as to render all other objects and incidents almoſt matters of indifference. The modern *Mennonites* not only conſider themſelves as the deſcendants of the *Waldenſes*, who were ſo grievouſly oppreſſed and perſecuted by the deſpotic heads of the Roman church, but pretend, moreover, to be the pureſt offspring of theſe reſpectable ſufferers, being equally averſe to all principles of rebellion, on the one hand, and all ſuggeſtions of fanaticiſm on the other [g]. Their adverſaries, on the contrary, repreſent them as the deſcendants of thoſe turbulent and furious *Anabaptiſts*, who, in the ſixteenth century, involved *Germany*, *Holland*, *Switzerland*, and more eſpecially the province of *Weſtphalia*, in ſuch ſcenes of blood, perplexity, and diſtreſs; and allege, that, terrified by the dreadful fate of their aſſociates, and alſo influenced by the moderate counſels and wiſe injunctions of MENNON, they abandoned the ferocity of their primitive enthuſiaſm, and were gradually brought to a better mind. After having examined theſe

---

the origin, progreſs, and revolutions of their ſect. And, indeed, after all, the Mennonites have not much reaſon to boaſt, either of the extraordinary learning or dexterity of this their patron; nay, it is even to be imagined, that they may eaſily find a more able defender. For an accurate account of the Mennonite hiſtorians, and their confeſſions of faith, ſee JO. CHRIST. KOECHERI *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 461.

[g] See HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Hiſtor. Mennon.* cap. i. p. 2. as alſo a Dutch work, intitled, GALENUS ABRAHAMZON, *Verdediging der Chriſtenen, die Doopſgezinde genamd worden*, p. 29.

two different accounts of the origin of the *Anabaptiſts* with the utmoſt attention and impartiality, I have found that neither of them are exactly conformable to truth.

The moſt probable account of the origin of the Anabaptiſts.

II. It may be obſerved, in the firſt place, that the Mennonites are not entirely miſtaken when they boaſt of their deſcent from the Waldenſes, Petrobruſſians, and other ancient ſects, who are uſually conſidered as *witneſſes of the truth*, in the times of univerſal darkneſs and ſuperſtition. Before the riſe of LUTHER and CALVIN, there lay concealed, in almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, particularly in *Bohemia*, *Moravia*, *Switzerland*, and *Germany*, many perſons, who adhered tenaciouſly to the following doctrine, which the Waldenſes, Wickliffites, and Huſſites had maintained, ſome in a more diſguiſed, and others in a more open and public manner, *viz.* *That the kingdom of* CHRIST, *or the viſible church he had eſtabliſhed upon earth, was an aſſembly of true and real ſaints, and ought therefore to be inacceſſible to the wicked and unrighteous, and alſo exempt from all thoſe inſtitutions, which human prudence ſuggeſts, to oppoſe the progreſs of iniquity, or to correct and reform tranſgreſſors.* This maxim is the true ſource of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and diſcipline of the *Mennonites*; and it is moſt certain, that the greateſt part of theſe peculiarities were approved of by many of thoſe, who, before the dawn of the Reformation, entertained the notion already mentioned, relating to the viſible church of CHRIST [*b*]. There were, however,

---

[*b*] See for an account of the religious ſentiments of the *Waldenſes*, LIMBORCH's excellent *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, tranſlated into Engliſh by the learned Dr. SAMUEL CHANDLER, book I. chap. viii.—It appears from undoubted teſtimonies, that the *Wickliffites* and *Huſſites* did not differ extremely from the Waldenſes, concerning the point under conſideration. ☞ See alſo LYDII *Waldenſia*, and ALLIX's *Ancient churches of Piedmont*, ch. 22—26. p. 211—280. N.

different

different ways of thinking among the different members of this ſect, with reſpect to the methods of attaining to ſuch a perfect church-eſtabliſhment as they had in view. Some, who were of a fanatical complexion on the one hand, and were perſuaded, on the other, that ſuch a viſible church, as they had modelled out in fancy, could not be realiſed by the power of man, entertained the pleaſing hope, that God, in his own good time, would erect to himſelf an holy church, exempt from every degree of blemiſh and impurity, and would ſet apart, for the execution of this grand deſign, a certain number of choſen inſtruments, divinely aſſiſted and prepared for this work by the extraordinary ſuccours of his Holy Spirit. Others, of a more prudent and rational turn of mind, entertained different views of this matter. They neither expected ſtupendous miracles nor extraordinary revelations; ſince they were perſuaded, that it was poſſible, by human wiſdom, induſtry, and vigilance, to purify the church from the contagion of the wicked, and to reſtore it to the ſimplicity of its original conſtitution, provided that the manners and ſpirit of the primitive Chriſtians could but recover their loſt dignity and luſtre.

III. The drooping ſpirits of theſe people, who had been diſperſed through many countries, and perſecuted every where with the greateſt ſeverity, were revived when they were informed that LUTHER, ſeconded by ſeveral perſons of eminent piety, had ſucceſsfully attempted the reformation of the church. Then they ſpoke with openneſs and freedom, and the enthuſiaſm of the fanatical, as well as the prudence of the wiſe, diſcovered themſelves in their natural colours. Some of them imagined, that the time was now come in which God himſelf was to dwell with his ſervants in an extraordinary manner, by celeſtial ſuccours, and to eſtabliſh upon earth a kingdom truly ſpiritual and divine. Others, leſs ſanguine and chimerical in their expectations, flattered themſelves, nevertheleſs, with the fond hopes of the approach of that happy period, in which the reſtoration of the church, which had been ſo long expected in vain, was to be accompliſhed, under the divine protection, by the labours and counſels of pious and eminent men. This ſect was ſoon joined by great numbers, and (as uſually happens in ſudden revolutions of this nature) by many perſons, whoſe characters and capacities were very different, though their views ſeemed to turn upon the ſame object. Their progreſs was rapid; for, in a very ſhort ſpace of time, their diſcourſes, viſions, and predictions excited commotions in a great part of *Europe*, and drew into their communion a prodigious multitude, whoſe ignorance rendered them eaſy victims to the illuſions of enthuſiaſm. It is, however, to be obſerved, that as the leaders of this ſect had fallen into that erroneous and chimerical notion, that the new kingdom of CHRIST, which they expected, was to be exempt from every kind of vice, and from the ſmalleſt degree of imperfection and corruption, they were not ſatisfied with the plan of reformation propoſed by LUTHER. They looked upon it as much beneath the ſublimity of their views, and, conſequently, undertook a more perfect reformation, or, to expreſs more properly their viſionary enterpriſe, they propoſed to found a new church, entirely ſpiritual, and truly divine.

The firſt motions of the Anabaptiſts.

IV. It is difficult to determine, with certainty, the particular ſpot that gave birth to that ſeditious and peſtilential ſect of Anabaptiſts, whoſe tumultuous and deſperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cauſe of religion, and the civil intereſts of mankind. Whether they firſt aroſe in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, or the *Netherlands*, is, as yet, a matter of debate, whoſe deciſion is of no great importance [*i*]. It is moſt probable, that ſeveral perſons of this odious claſs made their appearance, at the ſame time, in different countries; and we may fix this period ſoon after the dawn of the Reformation in *Germany*, when LUTHER aroſe to ſet bounds to the ambition of *Rome*. This appears from a variety of circumſtances, and eſpecially from this ſtriking one, that the firſt *Anabaptiſt* doctors of any eminence, were, almoſt all, heads and leaders of particular and ſeparate ſects. For it muſt be carefully obſerved, that though all theſe projectors of a new, unſpotted, and perfect church, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Anabaptiſts*, on account of their oppoſing the baptiſm of infants, and their rebaptiſing ſuch as had received that ſacrament in a ſtate of childhood in other churches, yet they were, from their very origin, ſubdivided into various ſects, which differed from each other in points of no ſmall moment. The moſt pernicious faction of all thoſe that compoſed this motley multitude, was that which pretended that the founders of the new and *perfect church*, already mentioned, were under the direction of a divine impulſe, and were armed againſt all oppoſition by the power of working miracles. It was this deteſtable faction that, in the year 1521, began their fanatical work, under the guidance of MUNZER, STUBNER, STORCK, and other leaders of the ſame furious complexion, and excited the moſt unhappy tumults and commotions in *Saxony* and the adjacent countries. They employed at firſt the various arts of perſuaſion, in order to propagate their doctrine. They preached, exhorted, admoniſhed, and reaſoned in a manner that ſeemed proper to gain the multitude, and related a great number of viſions and revelations with which they pretended to have been favoured from above. But when they ſaw that theſe methods of making proſelytes were not attended with ſuch a rapid ſucceſs as they fondly expected, and that the miniſtry of LUTHER, and other eminent reformers, was detrimental to their cauſe, they then had recourſe to more expeditious meaſures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms. MUNZER and his aſſociates aſſembled, in the year 1525, a numerous army, compoſed, for the moſt part, of the peaſants of *Suabia*, *Thuringia*, *Franconia*, and *Saxony*, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war againſt all laws, government and magiſtrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext, that CHRIST was now to take the reins of civil and eccleſiaſtical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. But this ſeditious crowd was routed and diſperſed, without much difficulty, by the elector of *Saxony* and other princes; MUNZER, their ringleader, ignominiouſly put to death, and his factious counſellors ſcattered abroad in different places [k].

[*i*] FUESLIN has attempted to examine, whether the Anabaptiſts firſt aroſe in *Germany* or *Switzerland*, in a German work, entitled, *Beytrage zur Schweizeriſch Reformat. Geſchichte*, tom. i. p. 190. tom. ii. p. 64, 65. 265. 327, 328. tom. iii. p. 323. but without ſucceſs.

The progreſs of this ſect.

V. This bloody defeat of one part of theſe ſeditious and turbulent fanatics, did not produce that effect upon the reſt that might naturally have been expected; it rendered them, indeed, more timorous, but it did not open their eyes upon this deluſion. It is certain, that, even after this period, numbers of them, who were infected with the ſame odious principles that occaſioned the deſtruction of MUNZER, wandered about in *Germany*, *Switzerland*, and *Holland*, and excited the people to rebellion by their ſeditious diſcourſes. They gathered together congregations in ſeveral places, foretold, in conſequence of a divine commiſſion, the approaching abolition of magiſtracy, and the downfal of civil rulers and governors; and, while they pretended to be ambaſſadors of the Moſt High, inſulted, on many occaſions, the Majeſty of Heaven by the moſt flagitious crimes. Thoſe who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the enormity of their conduct in this infamous ſect, were LEWIS HETZER, BALTHAZAR HUBMEYER, FELIX MENTZ, CONRAD GREBEL, MELCHIOR HOFFMAN, and GEORGE JACOB, who, if their power had ſeconded their deſigns, would have involved all *Switzerland*, *Holland*, and *Germany*, in tumult and bloodſhed [*l*]. A great part of this rabble ſeemed really delirious; and nothing more extravagant or more incredible can be imagined than the dreams and viſions that were conſtantly ariſing in their diſordered brains. Such of them as had ſome ſparks of reaſon left, and had reflection enough to reduce their notions into a certain form, maintained, among others, the following points of doctrine: That *the church of* CHRIST *ought to be exempt from all ſin—that all things ought to be in common among the faithful—that all uſury, tythes, and tribute, ought to be entirely aboliſhed —that the baptiſm of infants was an invention of the devil—that every Chriſtian was inveſted with a*

---

[k] See SECKENDORF, *Hiſtor. Lutheraniſmi*, lib. i. p. 192. 304. lib. ii. p. 13.—SLEIDAN, *Commentar.* lib. v. p. 47.—JOACH. CAMERARII *Vita Melanchthonis*, p. 44.

[*l*] See JO. BAPT. OTTII *Annales Anabaptiſt.* p. 21.—JO. HORNBECKII *Summa controverſ.* lib. v. p. 332.—ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analect. veteris ævi*, tom. iv. p. 629. 677. 679.—BERNARD. RAUPACHII *Auſtriæ Evangel.* tom. ii. p. 41.—JO. GEORG. SCHELHORN, *in Actis ad Hiſtor. Eccleſ. pertinentibus*, tom. i. p. 100.—GODOFR. ARNOLDI *Hiſtoria Hæretica*, lib. xvi. cap. xxi. p. 727.—As alſo the German work of FUESLIN, entitled, *Beyträgen zu der Schwicizer Reform. Geſchichte.*

power to preach the Goſpel—and conſequently, that the church ſtood in no need of miniſters or paſtors—that in the kingdom of CHRIST *civil magiſtrates were abſolutely uſeleſs—and that God ſtill continued to reveal his will to choſen perſons by dreams and viſions* [m].

It would betray, however, a ſtrange ignorance, or an unjuſtifiable partiality, to maintain, that even all thoſe that profeſſed, in general, this abſurd doctrine, were chargeable with that furious and brutal extravagance which has been mentioned as the character of too great a part of their ſect. This was by no means the caſe; ſeveral of theſe enthuſiaſts diſcovered a milder and more pacific ſpirit, and were free from any other reproach, than that which reſulted from the errors they maintained, and their too ardent deſire of ſpreading them among the multitude. It may ſtill further be affirmed with truth, that many of thoſe who followed the wiſer claſs of *Anabaptiſts*, nay, ſome who adhered to the moſt extravagant factions of that ſect, were men of upright intentions and ſincere piety, who were ſeduced into this myſtery of fanaticiſm and iniquity, by their ignorance and ſimplicity on the one hand, and by a laudable deſire of reforming the corrupt ſtate of religion on the other.

Severe puniſhments inflicted on the Anabaptiſts.

VI. The progreſs of this turbulent ſect in almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, alarmed all that had any concern for the public good. Kings, princes, and ſovereign ſtates, exerted themſelves to check theſe rebellious enthuſiaſts in their career, by iſſuing out, firſt, ſevere edicts to reſtrain their violence, and employing, at length, capital puniſhments to conquer their obſtinacy [n]. But here a maxim, already verified by repeated experience, received a new degree of confirmation; for the conduct of the *Anabaptiſts*, under the preſſures of perſecution, plainly ſhewed the extreme difficulty of correcting or influencing, by the proſpect of ſuffering, or even by the terrors of death, minds that are either deeply tainted with the poiſon of fanaticiſm, or firmly bound by the ties of religion. In almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, an unſpeakable number of theſe unhappy wretches preferred death, in its worſt forms, to a retractation of their errors. Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to conſume them, nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the ſword, could ſhake their invincible, but ill-placed conſtancy, or make them abandon tenets, that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments. The *Mennonites* have preſerved voluminous records of the lives, actions, and unhappy fate of thoſe of their ſect, who ſuffered death for the crimes of rebellion or hereſy, which were imputed to them [*o*]. Certain it is, that they were treated with ſeverity; but it is much to be lamented that ſo little diſtinction was made between the members of this ſect, when the ſword of juſtice was unſheathed againſt them. Why were

---

[m] This account of the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is principally taken from the learned FUESLIN already quoted.

[n] It was in *Saxony*, if I am not miſtaken, and alſo in the year 1525, that penal laws were firſt enacted againſt this fanatical

---

tical tribe. Theſe laws were renewed frequently in the years 1527, 1528, 1534. See a German work of the learned KAPPIUS, entitled, *Nachleſſe von Reformations Urkunden*, part I. p. 176.)—CHARLES V., incenſed at the increaſing impudence and iniquity of theſe enthuſiaſts, iſſued out againſt them ſevere edicts, in the years 1527 and 1529. (See OTTII *Annales Anabapt.* p. 45.)—The magiſtrates of *Switzerland* treated, at firſt, with remarkable lenity and indulgence, the *Anabaptiſts* that lived under their government; but when it was found that this lenity rendered them ſtill more enterpriſing and inſolent, it was judged proper to have recourſe to a different manner of proceeding. Accordingly the magiſtrates of *Zurich* denounced capital puniſhment againſt this riotous ſect in the year 1525.

[*o*] See JOACH. CHRIST. JEHRING, *Præfat. ad Hiſtoriam Mennonicarum*, p. 3.

the innocent and the guilty involved in the ſame fate? why were doctrines purely theological, or, at worſt, fanatical, puniſhed with the ſame rigour that was ſhewn to crimes inconſiſtent with the peace and welfare of civil ſociety? Thoſe who had no other marks of peculiarity than their adminiſtering baptiſm to adult perſons only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than what was given to thoſe ſeditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and deſtroying all civil authority. Many ſuffered for errors they had embraced with the moſt upright intentions, ſeduced by the eloquence and fervour of their doctors, and perſuading themſelves that they were contributing to the advancement of true religion. But, as the greateſt part of theſe enthuſiaſts had communicated to the multitude their viſionary notions concerning the new ſpiritual kingdom that was ſoon to be erected, and the abolition of magiſtracy and civil government that was to be the immediate effect of this great revolution, this rendered the very name of *Anabaptiſts* unſpeakably odious, and made it always excite the idea of a ſeditious incendiary, a peſt to human ſociety. It is true, indeed, that many Anabaptiſts ſuffered death, not on account of their being conſidered as rebellious ſubjects, but merely becauſe they were judged to be *incurable Heretics*; for in this century the error of limiting the adminiſtration of baptiſm to adult perſons only, and the practice of rebaptiſing ſuch as had received that ſacrament in a ſtate of infancy, were looked upon as moſt flagitious and intolerable hereſies. It is, nevertheleſs, certain, that the greateſt part of theſe wretched ſufferers owed their unhappy fate to their rebellious principles and tumultuous proceedings, and that many alſo were puniſhed for their temerity

merity and imprudence, which led them to the commiſſion of various crimes.

The Anabaptiſts of Munſter.

VII. There ſtands upon record a moſt ſhocking inſtance of this, in the dreadful commotions that were excited at *Munſter*, in the year 1533, by certain Dutch Anabaptiſts, that choſe that city as the ſcene of their horrid operations, and committed in it ſuch deeds, as would ſurpaſs all credibility, were they not atteſted in a manner that excludes every degree of doubt and uncertainty. A handful of madmen, who had got into their heads the viſionary notion of a new and ſpiritual kingdom, ſoon to be eſtabliſhed in an extraordinary manner, formed themſelves into a ſociety, under the guidance of a few illiterate leaders choſen out of the populace. And they perſuaded, not only the ignorant multitude, but even ſeveral among the learned, that *Munſter* was to be the ſeat of this new and heavenly *Jeruſalem*, whoſe ghoſtly dominion was to be propagated from thence to all the ends of the earth. The ringleaders of this furious tribe were JOHN MATTHISON, JOHN BOCKHOLD, a taylor of *Leyden*, one GERHARD, with ſome others, whom the blind rage of enthuſiaſm, or the ſtill more culpable principles of ſedition, had embarked in this extravagant and deſperate cauſe. They made themſelves maſters of the city of *Munſter*, depoſed the magiſtrates, and committed all the enormous crimes, and ridiculous follies, which the moſt perverſe and infernal imagination could ſuggeſt [p]. JOHN BOCKHOLD was proclaimed king and legiſlator of this new Hierarchy; but his reign was tranſitory, and his

---

☞ [p] BOCKHOLDT, or BOCKELSON, alias JOHN of *Leyden*, who headed them at *Munſter*, ran ſtark naked in the ſtreets, married eleven wives, at the ſame time, to ſhew his approbation of polygamy, and entitled himſelf king of *Sion*; all which was but a very ſmall part of the pernicious follies of this mock monarch.

end deplorable. For the city of *Munſter* was, in the year 1536, retaken, after a long ſiege, by its biſhop and ſovereign, Count WALDECK, the *New Jeruſalem* of the Anabaptiſts deſtroyed, and its mock monarch puniſhed with a moſt painful and ignominious death [q]. The diſorders occaſioned by the Anabaptiſts at this period, not only in *Weſtphalia*, but alſo in other places [r], ſhewed

too

---

[q] See ANTON. CORVINI *Narratio de miſerabili Monaſter. Anabapt. excidio*, publiſhed firſt at *Wittemberg* in the year 1536.—CASP. SAGITTAR. *Introduct. in Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. i. p. 537 & 835.—HERM. HAMELMANN. *Hiſtoria Renati Evangelii in Urbe Monaſter. in Operib. Genealogico Hiſtoricis*, p. 1203.—The elegant Latin Poem of BOLANDUS in Elegiac verſe, entitled, JO. FABRICII BOLANDI *Motus Monaſterienſ. Libri Decem. Colon.* 1546, in 8vo.—HERM. KERSSENBROCK, *Hiſtor. Belli Monaſter.*—DAN. GERDES, *Miſcellan. Groningenſ. Nov.* tom. ii. p. 377. This latter author ſpeaks alſo of BERNARD ROTHMAN, an eccleſiaſtic of *Munſter*, who had introduced the Reformation into that city, but afterwards was infected with the enthuſiaſm of the Anabaptiſts; and though, in other reſpects he had ſhewn himſelf to be neither deſtitute of learning nor virtue, yet enliſted himſelf in this fanatical tribe, and had a ſhare in their moſt turbulent and furious proceedings.

☞ [r] The ſcenes of violence, tumult, and ſedition, that were exhibited in *Holland* by this odious tribe, were alſo terrible. They formed the deſign of reducing the city of *Leyden* to aſhes, but were happily prevented, and ſeverely puniſhed. JOHN of *Leyden*, the anabaptiſt king of *Munſter*, had taken it into his head that God had made him a preſent of the cities of *Amſterdam*, *Deventer*, and *Weſel*; in conſequence thereof, he ſent biſhops to theſe three places, to preach *his* goſpel of ſedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptiſts, of whom five were women, aſſembled at midnight in a private houſe at *Amſterdam*. One of them, who was a taylor by profeſſion, fell into a trance, and after having preached and prayed during the ſpace of four hours, ſtripped himſelf naked, threw his cloaths into the fire, and commanded all the aſſembly to do the ſame, in which he was obeyed without the leaſt reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the ſtreets *in this ſtate of nature*, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, *Woe! woe! the wrath of God! the wrath of God! woe to Babylon!* When, after being ſeized and brought before the magiſtrates, too plainly to what horrid lengths the pernicious doctrines of this wrong-headed ſect were adapted to lead the inconſiderate and unwary; and therefore it is not at all to be wondered, that the ſecular arm employed rigorous meaſures to extirpate a faction, which was the occaſion, nay the ſource, of unſpeakable calamities in ſo many countries [*s*].

Menno Simon.

VIII. While the terrors of death, in the moſt dreadful forms, were preſented to the view of this miſerable ſect, and numbers of them were executed every day, without a proper diſtinction being made between the innocent and the guilty, thoſe that eſcaped the ſeverity of juſtice, were in the moſt diſcouraging ſituation that can well be imagined. On the one hand, they beheld, with ſorrow, all their hopes blaſted by the total defeat of their brethren at *Munſter*; and, on the other, they were filled with the moſt anxious apprehenſions of the perils that threatened them on all ſides. In this critical ſituation they derived much

---

clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refuſed them obſtinately, and cried aloud, *We are the naked truth.* When they were brought to the ſcaffold, they ſung and danced, and diſcovered all the marks of enthuſiaſtic frenzy.—Theſe tumults were followed by a regular and deep-laid conſpiracy, formed by VAN GEELEN (an envoy of the mock-king of *Munſter*, who had made a very conſiderable number of proſelytes) againſt the magiſtrates of *Amſterdam*, with a deſign to wreſt the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched his fanatical troop to the town houſe on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head-quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, aſſiſted by ſome regular troops, and headed by ſeveral of the burgomaſters of the city. After an obſtinate reſiſtance he was ſurrounded, with his whole troop, who were put to death in the ſevereſt and moſt dreadful manner, to ſerve as examples to the other branches of the ſect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in *Frieſland*, *Groningen*, and other provinces and cities in the *Netherlands*.

[*s*] GER. BRANDT, *Hiſtor. Reform. Belgicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p. 119.

comfort and aſſiſtance from the counſels and zeal of MENNO SIMON, a native of *Frieſland*, who had formerly been a popiſh prieſt, and, as he himſelf confeſſes, a notorious profligate. This man went over to the Anabaptiſts, at firſt, in a clandeſtine manner, and frequented their aſſemblies with the utmoſt ſecrecy; but, in the year 1536, he threw off the maſk, reſigned his rank and office in the Romiſh church, and publicly embraced their communion. About a year after this, he was earneſtly ſolicited by many of the ſect to aſſume, among them, the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the perſons, from whom this propoſal came, to be exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at *Munſter* (though, according to other accounts, they were originally of the ſame ſtamp, only rendered ſomewhat wiſer by their ſufferings), he yielded to their entreaties. From this period to the end of his days, that is, during the ſpace of twenty-five years, he travelled from one country to another, with his wife and children, exerciſing his miniſtry under preſſures and calamities of various kinds that ſucceeded each other without interruption, and conſtantly expoſed to the danger of falling a victim to the ſeverity of the laws. *Eaſt* and *Weſt Frieſland*, together with the province of *Groningen*, were firſt viſited by this zealous apoſtle of the Anabaptiſts; from thence he directed his courſe into *Holland*, *Gelderland*, *Brabant*, and *Weſtphalia*, continued it through the German provinces that lie on the coaſts of the *Baltick* ſea, and penetrated ſo far as *Livonia*. In all theſe places his miniſterial labours were attended with remarkable ſucceſs, and added to his ſect a prodigious number of proſelytes. Hence he is deſervedly looked upon as the common chief of almoſt all the Anabaptiſts, and the parent of the ſect that ſtill ſubſiſts under that denomination. The ſucceſs of this miſſionary will not appear very ſurpriſing to thoſe who are acquainted with his character, ſpirit, and talents, and who have a juſt notion of the ſtate of the Anabaptiſts at the period of time now under conſideration. MENNO was a man of genius; though, as his writings ſhew, his genius was not under the direction of a very ſound judgment. He had the ineſtimable advantage of a natural and perſuaſive eloquence, and his learning was ſufficient to make him paſs for an oracle in the eyes of the multitude. He appears, moreover, to have been a man of probity, of a meek and tractable ſpirit, gentle in his manners, pliable and obſequious in his commerce with perſons of all ranks and characters, and extremely zealous in promoting practical religion and virtue, which he recommended by his example, as well as by his precepts. A man of ſuch talents and diſpoſitions could not fail to attract the admiration of the people, and to gain a great number of adherents wherever he exerciſed his miniſtry. But no where could he expect a more plentiful harveſt than among the *Anabaptiſts*, whoſe ignorance and ſimplicity rendered them peculiarly ſuſceptible of new impreſſions, and who, having been long accuſtomed to leaders that reſembled frenetic Bacchanals more than Chriſtian miniſters, and often deluded by odious impoſtors, who involved them in endleſs perils and calamities, were rejoiced to find at length a teacher, whoſe doctrine and manners ſeemed to promiſe them more proſperous days [*t*].

IX. MENNO

[*t*] MENNO was born at *Witmarſum*, a village in the neighbourhood of *Bolſwert* in *Frieſland*, in the year 1505, and not in 1496, as moſt writers tell us. After a life of toil, peril, and agitation, he departed in peace in the year 1561, in the duchy of *Holſtein*, at the country-ſeat of a certain nobleman, not far from the city of *Oldeſloe*, who, moved with compaſſion at a view of the perils to which MENNO was expoſed, and the

His doctrine.

IX. MENNO drew up a plan of doctrine and diſcipline of a much more mild and moderate nature than that of the furious and fanatical Anabaptiſts already mentioned, but ſomewhat more ſevere, though more clear and conſiſtent, than the doctrine of ſome of the wiſer branches of that ſect, who aimed at nothing more than reſtoration of the Chriſtian church to its primitive purity. Accordingly, he condemned the plan of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, that was founded on the proſpect of a new kingdom, to be miraculouſly eſtabliſhed by JESUS CHRIST on the ruins of civil government, and the deſtruction of human rulers, and which had been the fatal and peſtilential ſource of ſuch dreadful commotions, ſuch execrable rebellions, and ſuch enormous crimes. He declared, publicly, his diſlike of that doctrine; which pointed out the approach of a marvellous reformation in the church by the means of a new and *extraordinary* effuſion of the Holy Spirit. He expreſſed his abhorrence of the licentious tenets, which ſeveral of the Anabaptiſts had maintained, with reſpect to the lawfulneſs of polygamy and divorce; and, finally, conſidered, as unworthy of toleration, thoſe fanatics who were of opinion that the Holy Ghoſt continued to deſcend into the minds of many choſen believers, in as extraordinary a manner as he did at the firſt eſtabliſhment

---

the ſnares that were daily laid for his ruin, took him, together with certain of his aſſociates, into his protection, and gave him an aſylum. We have a particular account of this famous Anabaptiſt in the *Cimbria Literata* of MOLLERUS, tom. ii. p. 835. See alſo HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deduct. Hiſtor. Mennon.* cap. vi. p. 116.—The writings of MENNO, which are almoſt all compoſed in the Dutch language, were publiſhed in *folio*, at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1651. An exceſſively diffuſe and rambling ſtyle, frequent and unneceſſary repetitions, an irregular and confuſed method, with other defects of equal moment, render the peruſal of theſe productions highly diſagreeable.

of the Chriſtian church; and that he teſtified this peculiar preſence to ſeveral of the faithful, by miracles, predictions, dreams, and viſions of various kinds. He retained, indeed, the doctrines commonly received among the Anabaptiſts in relation to the baptiſm of infants, the *Millenium*, or thouſand years reign of CHRIST upon earth, the excluſion of magiſtrates from the Chriſtian church, the abolition of war, and the prohibition of oaths enjoined by our Saviour, and the vanity, as well as the pernicious effects, of human ſcience. But while MENNO retained theſe doctrines in a general ſenſe, he explained and modified them in ſuch a manner, as made them reſemble the religious tenets that were univerſally received in the proteſtant churches; and this rendered them agreeable to many, and made them appear inoffenſive even to numbers who had no inclination to embrace them. It however ſo happened, that the nature of the doctrines conſidered in themſelves, the eloquence of MENNO, which ſet them off to ſuch advantage, and the circumſtances of the times, gave a high degree of credit to the religious ſyſtem of this famous teacher among the Anabaptiſts, ſo that it made a rapid progreſs in that ſect. And thus it was in conſequence of the miniſtry of MENNO, that the different ſorts of Anabaptiſts agreed together in excluding from their communion the fanatics that diſhonoured it, and in renouncing all tenets that were detrimental to the authority of civil government, and, by an unexpected coalition, formed themſelves into one community [*u*].

[*u*] Theſe facts ſhew us plainly how the famous queſtion concerning the origin of the modern Anabaptiſts may be reſolved. The Mennonites oppoſe, with all their might, the account of their deſcent from the ancient Anabaptiſts, which we find in ſo many writers, and would willingly give the

X. To preſerve a ſpirit of union and concord in a body compoſed of ſuch a motley multitude of

The origin of the ſects that have ſtarted up among the Anabaptiſts.

the modern Anabaptiſts a more honourable origin. (See SCHYN, *Hiſtor. Mennonitar.* cap. viii. ix. xxi. p. 223.) The reaſon of their zeal in this matter is evident. Their ſituation has rendered them timorous. They live, as it were, in the midſt of their enemies, and are conſtantly filled with an uneaſy apprehenſion, that ſome day or other, malevolent zealots may take occaſion, from their ſuppoſed origin, to renew againſt them the penal laws, by which the ſeditious Anabaptiſts of ancient times ſuffered in ſuch a dreadful manner. At leaſt, they imagine that the *odium*, under which they lie, will be greatly diminiſhed, if they can prove, to the ſatisfaction of the public, the falſehood of that generally received opinion, that the *Mennonites are the deſcendants of the Anabaptiſts, or,* to ſpeak more properly, *the ſame individual ſect, purged from the fanaticiſm that formerly diſgraced it, and rendered wiſer than their anceſtors, by reflexion and ſuffering.*

After comparing diligently and impartially together what has been alleged by the Mennonites and their adverſaries in relation to this matter, I cannot ſee what it is, properly, that forms the ſubject of their controverſy; and, if the merits of the cauſe be ſtated with accuracy and perſpicuity, I do not ſee how there can be any diſpute at all about the matter now under conſideration: For, in the

Firſt place, if the Mennonites mean nothing more than this: that MENNO, whom they conſidered as their parent and their chief, was not infected with thoſe odious opinions which drew the juſt ſeverity of the laws upon the Anabaptiſts of *Munſter*; that he neither looked for a new and ſpotleſs kingdom that was to be miraculouſly erected on earth, nor excited the multitude to depoſe magiſtrates, and aboliſh civil government; that he neither deceived himſelf, nor impoſed upon others, by fanatical pretenſions to dreams and viſions of a ſupernatural kind; if (I ſay) this be all that the Mennonites mean, when they ſpeak of their chief, no perſon, acquainted with the hiſtory of their ſect, will pretend to contradict them. Nay, even thoſe who maintain that there was an immediate and intimate connexion between the ancient and modern Anabaptiſts, will readily allow to be true all that has been here ſaid of MENNO. —*2dly*, If the Anabaptiſts maintain, that ſuch of their churches as received their doctrine and diſcipline from MENNO, have not only diſcovered, without interruption, a pacific ſpirit and an unlimited ſubmiſſion to civil governmeut (abſtaining from every thing that carried the remoteſt aſpect of ſedition, and ſhewing the utmoſt abhorrence of wars and blood-of diſſonant members, required more than human power; and MENNO neither had, nor pretended to

ſhed), but have even baniſhed from their *confeſſions* of faith, and their religious inſtructions, all thoſe tenets and principles that led on the ancient Anabaptiſts to diſobedience, violence, and rebellion; all this, again, will be readily granted.—And if they allege, in the third place, that even the Anabaptiſts, who lived before MENNO, were not *all* ſo delirious as MUNZER, nor ſo outrageous as the fanatical part of that ſect, that rendered their memory eternally odious by the enormities they committed at *Munſter*; that, on the contrary, many of theſe ancient Anabaptiſts abſtained religiouſly from all acts of violence and ſedition, followed the pious examples of the ancient Waldenſes, Henricians, Petrobruſſians, Huſſites, and Wickliffites, and adopted the doctrine and diſcipline of MENNO, as ſoon as that new parent aroſe to reform and patronize the ſect; all this will be allowed without heſitation.

But, on the other hand, the Mennonites may aſſert many things in defence of the purity of their origin, which cannot be admitted by any perſon who is free from prejudice, and well acquainted with their hiſtory, If they maintain, *1ſt*, that none of their ſect deſcended, by birth, from thoſe Anabaptiſts, who involved *Germany* and other countries in the moſt dreadful calamities, or that none of theſe furious fanatics adopted the doctrine and diſcipline of MENNO, they may be eaſily refuted by a great number of facts and teſtimonies, and particularly by the declarations of MENNO himſelf, who glories in his having conquered the ferocity, and reformed the lives and errors of ſeveral members of this peſtilential ſect. Nothing can be more certain than this fact, *viz.* that the firſt Mennonite congregations were compoſed of the different ſorts of Anabaptiſts already mentioned, of thoſe who had been always inoffenſive and upright, and of thoſe who, before their converſion by the miniſtry of MENNO, had been ſeditious fanatics. Nor can the acknowledgment of this inconteſtible fact be a juſt matter of reproach to the Mennonites, or be more diſhonourable to them, than it is to us, that our anceſtors were warmly attached to the idolatrous and extravagant worſhip of paganiſm or popery.—Again; it will not be poſſible for us to agree with the *Mennonites*, if they maintain, *2dly*, that their ſect does not retain, at this day, any of thoſe tenets, or even any remains of thoſe opinions and doctrines, which led the ſeditious and turbulent Anabaptiſts of old to the commiſſion of ſo many and of ſuch enormous crimes. For, not to mention MENNO's calling the Anabaptiſts of *Munſter* his *Brethren* (a denomination indeed ſomewhat ſoftened by the epithet of *erring*, which he joined to it), it is undoubtedly true, that the doctrine concerning the nature to have, ſupernatural ſuccours. Accordingly, the ſeeds of diſſenſion were, in a little time, ſown among this people. About the middle of this century, a warm conteſt, concerning *Excommunication*, was excited by ſeveral Anabaptiſts, headed by LEONARD BOWENSON and THEODORE PHILIP; and its fruits are yet viſible in that divided ſect. Theſe men carried the diſcipline of excommunication to an enormous degree of ſeverity and rigour. They not only maintained, that open tranſgreſſors, even thoſe who ſincerely deplored and lamented their faults, ſhould, without any previous warning or admonition, be expelled from the communion of the church; but were alſo audacious enough to pretend to exclude the perſons, thus excommunicated, from all intercourſe with their wives, huſbands, brothers, ſiſters, children, and relations. The ſame perſons, as might naturally be expected from this ſample of their ſeverity, were harſh and rigid in their manners, and were for impoſing upon their brethren a courſe of moral diſcipline, which was difficult and auſtere in the higheſt degree. Many of the Anabaptiſts proteſted againſt this, as unreaſonable and unneceſſary;

---

nature of *Chriſt's kingdom*, or the *Church of the New Teſtament*, which led, by degrees, the ancient Anabaptiſts to thoſe furious acts of rebellion that have rendered them ſo odious, is by no means effaced in the minds of the modern Mennonites. It is, indeed, weakened and modified in ſuch a manner as to have loſt its noxious qualities, and to be no longer pernicious in its influence; but it is not totally renounced nor aboliſhed.—I ſhall not now enquire how far even the reformed and milder ſect of MENNO has been, in time paſt, exempt from tumults and commotions of a grievous kind, nor ſhall I examine what paſſes at this day among the Anabaptiſts in general, or in particular branches of that ſect; ſince it is certain, that the more eminent communities of that denomination, particularly thoſe that flouriſh in *North Holland*, and the places adjacent, behold fanatics with the utmoſt averſion, as appears evidently from this circumſtance, among others, that they will not ſuffer the people called *Quakers* to enter into their communion.

ceſſary; and thus the community was, all of a ſudden, divided into two ſects; of which the one treated tranſgreſſors with lenity and moderation, while the other proceeded againſt them with the utmoſt rigour. Nor was this the only difference that was obſervable in the conduct and manners of theſe two parties; ſince the latter was remarkable for the ſordid auſterity that reigned in their rules of life and practice; while the former, conſidering more wiſely the preſent ſtate of human nature, were leſs ſevere in their injunctions, and were not altogether regardleſs of what is called decent, agreeable, and ornamental in life and manners. MENNO employed his moſt vigorous efforts to heal theſe diviſions, and to reſtore peace and concord in the community; but when he perceived that his attempts were vain, he conducted himſelf in ſuch a manner as he thought the moſt proper to maintain his credit and influence among both parties. For this purpoſe he declared himſelf for neither ſide, but was conſtantly trimming between the two, as long as he lived; at one time, diſcovering an inclination towards the auſtere Anabaptiſts; and, at another, ſeeming to prefer the milder diſcipline and manners of the more moderate brethren. But in this he acted in oppoſition to the plaineſt dictates of prudence; and accordingly the high degree of authority he enjoyed, rendered his inconſtancy and irreſolution not only diſagreeable to both parties, but alſo the means of inflaming, inſtead of healing, their diviſions [w].

The rigid and moderate Anabaptiſts.

XI. Theſe two ſects are, to this very day, diſtinguiſhed by the denominations of *fine* and

---

[w] See the *Hiſtoria Bellorum et Certaminum quæ, ab A.* 1615, *inter Mennonitas contigerunt*, which was publiſhed by an anonymous Mennonite.—See alſo a German work, entitled, SIM. FRED. RUES, *Nachrichten von dem Zuſtande der Mennoniten*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Jena*, in the year 1743.

groſs [x], or, to expreſs the diſtinction in more intelligible terms, into *rigid* and *moderate* Anabaptiſts. The former obſerve, with the moſt religious accuracy, veneration, and preciſion, the ancient doctrine, diſcipline, and precepts of the purer ſort of Anabaptiſts; the latter depart much more from the primitive ſentiments, manners, and inſtitutions of their ſect, and approach nearer to thoſe of the proteſtant churches. The *groſs* or *moderate* Anabaptiſts conſiſted, at firſt, of the inhabitants of a diſtrict in *North Holland*, called *Waterland*, and hence their whole ſect was diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of *Waterlandians* [y]. The *fine* or *rigid* part of that community were, for the moſt part, natives of *Flanders*; and hence their ſect acquired the denomination of *Flemingians*, or *Flandrians*. But new diſſenſions and conteſts aroſe among theſe *rigid* Anabaptiſts, not, indeed,

---

☞ [x] The terms *fine* and *groſs* are a literal tranſlation of *groben* and *feinen*, which are the German denominations uſed to diſtinguiſh theſe two ſects. The ſame terms have been introduced among the Proteſtants in *Holland*; the *fine* denoting a ſet of people, whoſe extraordinary, and ſometimes fanatical, devotion, reſembles that of the Engliſh Methodiſts; while the *groſs* is applied to the generality of Chriſtians, who make no extraordinary pretenſions to uncommon degrees of ſanctity and devotion.

[y] See FRID. SPANHEMII *Elenchus Controverſ. Theol. Opp.* tom. iii. p. 772. The Waterlandians were alſo called *Johannites*, from JOHN DE RIES, who was of great uſe to them in many reſpects, and who, aſſiſted by LUBERT GERARD, compoſed their confeſſion of faith in the year 1580. This confeſſion (which far ſurpaſſes both in point of ſimplicity and wiſdom all the other confeſſions of the Mennonites) has paſſed through ſeveral editions, and has been lately republiſhed by HERMAN SCHYN, in his *Hiſtor. Mennon.* cap. vii. p. 172. It was alſo illuſtrated in an ample Commentary, in the year 1686, by PETER JOANNIS, a native of *Holland*, and paſtor among the Waterlandians. It has, however, been alleged, that this famous production is by no means the general confeſſion of the Waterlandians, but the private one only of that particular congregation, of which its author was the paſtor. See RUES, *Nachrichten*, p. 93, 94.

concerning any point of doctrine, but about the manner of treating perſons that were to be excommunicated, and other matters of inferior moment. Hence a new ſchiſm aroſe, and they were ſubdivided into new ſects, diſtinguiſhed by the appellations of *Flandrians* and *Frieſlanders,* who differed from each other in their manners and diſcipline. To theſe were added a third, who took the name of their country, like the two former, and were called *Germans*; for the Anabaptiſts of *Germany* paſſed in ſhoals into *Holland* and the *Netherlands*. But, in proceſs of time, the greateſt part of theſe three ſects came over, by degrees, to the moderate community of the *Waterlandians,* with whom they lived in the ſtricteſt bonds of peace and union. Thoſe among the rigid Anabaptiſts, who refuſed to follow this example of moderation, are ſtill known by the denomination of the *Old Flemingians,* or *Flandrians,* but are few in number, when compared with the united congregations of the milder ſects now mentioned.

The ſource from which the Mennonites drew their doctrine.

XII. No ſooner had the ferment of enthuſiaſm ſubſided among the Mennonites, than all the different ſects, into which they had been divided, unanimouſly agreed to draw the whole ſyſtem of their religious doctrine from the Holy Scriptures alone. To give a ſatisfactory proof of the ſincerity of their reſolution in this reſpect, they took care to have *Confeſſions* drawn up, in which their ſentiments concerning the Deity, and the manner of ſerving him, were expreſſed in the terms and phraſes of Holy Writ. The moſt ancient, and alſo the moſt reſpectable of theſe *Confeſſions,* is that which we find among the *Waterlandians.* Several others, of later date, were alſo compoſed, ſome for the uſe of large communities, for the people of a whole diſtrict, and which were conſequently ſubmitted to the inſpection of the magiſtrate; others deſigned only for the benefit of private ſocieties.

cieties [z]. It might not, perhaps, be amiſs to enquire, whether all the tenets received among the Mennonites are faithfully exhibited and plainly expreſſed in theſe *Confeſſions*, or whether ſeveral points be not there omitted which relate to the internal conſtitution of this ſect, and would give us a complete idea of its nature and tendency. One thing is certain, that whoever peruſes theſe *Confeſſions* with an ordinary degree of attention, will eaſily perceive, that thoſe tenets which appear detrimental to the intereſts of civil ſociety, particularly thoſe that relate to the prerogatives of magiſtracy, and the adminiſtration of oaths, are expreſſed with the utmoſt caution, and embelliſhed with the greateſt art, to prevent their bearing an alarming aſpect. At the ſame time, the more diſcerning obſerver will ſee, that theſe embelliſhments are intended to diſguiſe the truth, and that the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts, concerning the critical points above mentioned, are not repreſented, in their public *Confeſſions*, in their real colours.

Their religion was late reduced into a ſyſtem.

XIII. The ancient Anabaptiſts, who truſted in an extraordinary direction of the Holy Spirit, were (under the pretended influence of ſo infallible a guide) little ſolicitous about compoſing a ſyſtem of religion, and never once thought of inſtilling into the minds of the people juſt ſentiments of the Deity. Hence the warm diſſenſions that aroſe among them, concerning matters of the higheſt conſequence, ſuch as the *Divinity of* CHRIST, *Polygamy*, and *Divorce.* MENNO and his diſciples made ſome attempts to ſupply this defect. But nevertheleſs we find, after his time, that the Mennonites, more eſpecially thoſe of the *rigid* claſs, carried the freedom of their religious ſpeculations to ſuch an exceſſive height, as bordered upon extravagance. This circumſtance alone, were there no other, proves that the heads of this ſect employed the ſmalleſt part of their zeal to prevent the introduction and propagation of error; and that they looked upon ſanctity of life and manners alone as the eſſence of true religion. The *Waterlandians*, indeed, and after them the other Anabaptiſts, were obliged, at length, to draw up a ſummary of their doctrine, and to lay it before the public, in order to remove the *odium* that was caſt upon them, on account of their bold tenets, and their extravagant diſputes, which were likely to involve them in the greateſt calamities. But theſe *Confeſſions* of the *Mennonites* were, in reality, little more than a method of defence, to which they were reduced by the oppoſition they met with, and muſt therefore be rather conſidered as an expedient to avert the indignation of their enemies, than as articles of doctrine, which all of them, without exception, were obliged to believe. For we do not find among the Mennonites (a part of the modern *Waterlandians* excepted) any injunction, which expreſsly prohibits individuals from entertaining or propagating religious opinions different from the public creed of the community. And, indeed, when we look attentively into the nature and conſtitution of this ſect, it will appear to have been, in ſome meaſure, founded upon this principle, that practical piety is the eſſence of religion, and that the ſureſt and moſt infallible mark of the *true church* is the ſanctity of its members; it is at leaſt certain, that this *principle* was always univerſally adopted by the Anabaptiſts.

---

[z] See an account of theſe *Confeſſions* in SCHYN's *Plenior Deduct. Hiſt. Mennon.* cap. iv. p. 78. 115. where he maintains, that *theſe Confeſſions prove as great a uniformity among the Mennonites, in relation to the great and fundamental doctrines of religion, as can be pretended to by any other Chriſtian community*. But ſhould the good man even ſucceed in perſuading us of this boaſted uniformity, he will yet never be able to make his aſſertion go down with many of his own brethren, who are, to this day, quarrelling about ſeveral points of religion, and who look upon matters, which appear to him of little conſequence, as of high moment and importance to the cauſe of true piety. And, indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before this preſent century, believe what SCHYN here affirms, ſince it is well known, that they diſputed about matters which he treats with contempt, as if they had been immediately connected with their eternal intereſts?

The religion of the Mennonites.

XIV. If we are to form our judgment of the religion of the *Mennonites* from their public creeds and confeſſions, we ſhall find, that though it varies widely from the doctrine of the Lutherans, yet in moſt things it differs but little from that of the Reformed church. They conſider the ſacraments in no other light, than as *ſigns* or ſymbols of the ſpiritual bleſſings adminiſtered in the Goſpel; and their eccleſiaſtical diſcipline ſeems to be almoſt entirely the ſame with that of the *Preſbyterians*. There are, however, peculiar tenets, by which they are diſtinguiſhed from all other religious communities, and theſe may be reduced under three heads. For it is obſervable, that there are certain doctrines, which are held in common by all the various ſects of the Mennonites: others, which are only received in ſome of the more eminent and numerous ſects of that community (ſuch were the ſentiments of MENNO, which hindered him from being univerſally acceptable to the Anabaptiſts); and others, again, which are only to be found among the more obſcure and inconſiderable ſocieties of that denomination. Theſe laſt, indeed, appear and vaniſh, alternately, with the tranſitory ſects that adopt them, and therefore do not deſerve to employ our attention any farther in this place.

The great principle on which the general doctrine of the Mennonites is founded.

XV. The opinions that are held in common by the Mennonites ſeem to be all derived from this leading and fundamental principle, that *the kingdom which* CHRIST *eſtabliſhed upon earth is a viſible church, or community, into which the holy and the juſt*

juſt are alone to be admitted, and which is conſequently exempt from all thoſe inſtitutions and rules of diſcipline, that have been invented by human wiſdom, for the correction and reformation of the wicked.

This fanatical principle was frankly avowed by the ancient Mennonites: their more immediate deſcendants, however, began to be leſs ingenuous; and in their public *Confeſſions of Faith*, they either diſguiſed it under ambiguous phraſes, or expreſſed themſelves as if they meant to renounce it entirely. To renounce it entirely was impoſſible, without falling into the greateſt inconſiſtency, and undermining the very foundation of thoſe doctrines that diſtinguiſhed them from all other Chriſtian ſocieties [*a*]. And yet it is certain that the preſent Mennonites, as they have, in many other reſpects, departed from the principles and maxims of their anceſtors; ſo have they given a ſtriking inſtance of defection in the caſe now before us, and have almoſt wholly renounced this fundamental doctrine of their ſect, relating to the nature of the Chriſtian church. A diſmal experience has convinced them of the abſurdity of this chimerical principle, which the dictates of reaſon, and the declarations of ſcripture, had demonſtrated ſufficiently, but without effect. Now, that the Mennonites have opened their eyes, they ſeem to be pretty generally agreed about the following tenets: *Firſt*, that there is an *inviſible* church, which is univerſal in its extent, and is compoſed of members from all the ſects and communities that bear the Chriſtian name: *Secondly*, that the mark of the true church is not, as their former doctrine ſuppoſed, to be ſought for in the unſpotted ſanctity of all its members (ſince they acknowledge that the viſible church is promiſcuouſly compoſed of the righteous and the wicked), but in the knowledge of the truth, as it was delivered by CHRIST, and in the agreement of all the members of the church in profeſſing and defending it.

[*a*] That they did not renounce it entirely, is evident from their own *Creeds and Confeſſions*, even from thoſe in which the greateſt caution has been employed to conceal the principles that rendered their anceſtors odious, and to diſguiſe whatever might render themſelves liable to ſuſpicion. For example, they ſpeak in the moſt pompous terms concerning the dignity, excellence, utility, and divine origin, of civil magiſtrates; and I am willing to ſuppoſe that they ſpeak their real ſentiments in this matter. But when they proceed to give reaſons that prevent their admitting magiſtrates into their communion, they diſcover unwarily the very principles which they are otherwiſe ſo ſtudious to conceal. Thus, in the thirtieth article of the Waterlandian Confeſſion, they declare, that *Jeſus Chriſt has not comprehended the inſtitution of civil magiſtracy in his ſpiritual kingdom, in the church of the New Teſtament, nor has he added it to the offices of his church:* The Latin words are: *Poteſtatem hanc politicam Dominus Jeſus in regno ſuo ſpirituali, eccleſia Novi Teſtamenti, non inſtituit, neque hanc officiis eccleſiæ ſuæ adjunxit.* Hence it appears, that the Mennonites look upon the church of the New Teſtament as a holy republic, inacceſſible to the wicked, and, conſequently, exempt from thoſe inſtitutions and laws that are neceſſary to oppoſe the progreſs of iniquity. Why then do they not ſpeak plainly, when they deliver their doctrine concerning the nature of the church, inſtead of affecting ambiguity and evaſions?

Their peculiar tenets or doctrines.

XVI. Notwithſtanding all this, it is manifeſt, beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, that the religious opinions which ſtill diſtinguiſh the Mennonites from all other Chriſtian communities, flow directly from the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptiſts concerning the nature of the church. It is in conſequence of this doctrine, that *they admit none to the ſacrament of baptiſm but perſons that are come to the full uſe of their reaſon*; becauſe infants are incapable of binding themſelves by a ſolemn vow to a holy life, and it is altogether uncertain whether or no, in maturer years, they will be ſaints or ſinners: It is in conſequence of the ſame doctrine, that *they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magiſtracy*; for where there

are

are no malefactors, magiſtrates are uſeleſs. Hence do they pretend alſo *to deny the lawfulneſs of repelling force by force, and conſider war, in all its ſhapes, as unchriſtian and unjuſt*; for as thoſe who are *perfectly holy*, can neither be provoked by injuries, nor commit them, they do not ſtand in need of the force of arms, either for the purpoſes of reſentment or defence. It is ſtill the ſame principle that excites in them *the utmoſt averſion to the execution of juſtice, and more eſpecially to capital puniſhments*; ſince, according to this principle, there are no tranſgreſſions nor crimes in the kingdom of CHRIST, and conſequently no occaſion for the arm of the judge. Nor can it be imagined, that *they ſhould refuſe to confirm their teſtimony by an oath* upon any other foundation than this, that *the perfect members of a holy church* can neither *diſſemble* nor *deceive*. It was certainly then the ancient doctrine of the Anabaptiſts, concerning the ſanctity of the church, that gave riſe to the tenets now mentioned, and that was the ſource of that rigid and ſevere diſcipline, which excited ſuch tumults and diviſions among the members of that community.

Their ſyſtem of morality.

XVII. The rules of moral diſcipline, that were formerly obſerved by the Mennonites, were rigorous and auſtere in the higheſt degree, and thus every way conformable to the fundamental principle, which has been already mentioned as the ſource of all their peculiar tenets. It is ſomewhat doubtful whether theſe rules ſtill ſubſiſt and are reſpected among them; but it is certain, that in the times of old their moral precepts were very ſevere. And indeed it could not well be otherwiſe; for, when theſe people had once got it into their heads, that *ſanctity of manners* was the *only* genuine mark of the true church, it may well be imagined, that they would ſpare no pains to obtain this honourable character for their ſect; and that, for this purpoſe, they would uſe the ſtricteſt precautions to guard their brethren againſt diſgracing their profeſſion by immoral practices. Hence it was, that they unanimouſly, and no doubt juſtly, exalted the rules of the Goſpel, on account of their tranſcendent purity. They alleged, that CHRIST had promulgated a new law of life, far more perfect than that which had been delivered by MOSES and the Prophets; and they excluded from their communion all ſuch as deviated, in the leaſt, from the moſt rigorous rules of ſimplicity and gravity in their looks, their geſtures, their clothing, and their table: all whoſe deſires ſurpaſſed the dictates of mere neceſſity: nay, even all who obſerved a certain decorum in their manners, and paid a decent regard to the innocent cuſtoms of the world. But this primitive auſterity is greatly diminiſhed in the more conſiderable ſects of the Mennonites, and more eſpecially among the Waterlandians and Germans. The opulence they have acquired, by their induſtry and commerce, has relaxed their ſeverity, ſoftened their manners, and rendered them leſs inſenſible of the ſweets of life; ſo that at this day the Mennonite congregations furniſh their paſtors with as much matter of cenſure and admonition as any other Chriſtian community [b]. There are, however, ſtill ſome remains of the abſtinence and ſeverity of manners that prevailed formerly among the Anabaptiſts; but theſe are only to be found among ſome of the ſmaller ſects of that perſuaſion, and more particularly among thoſe who live remote from great and populous cities.

The ſingular tenet of ſome ſects.

XVIII. The particular ſentiments and opinions that divided the more conſiderable ſocieties of the Mennonites,

---

☞ [b] It is certain, that the Mennonites in *Holland*, at this day, are, in their tables, their equipages, and their country ſeats, the moſt luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more eſpecially true of the Mennonites of *Amſterdam*, who are very numerous and extremely opulent.

Mennonites, were thoſe that follow: 1. Menno denied that Christ derived from his mother the body he aſſumed; and thought, on the contrary, that it was produced out of nothing, in the womb of that bleſſed virgin, by the *creating* power of the Holy Ghoſt [c]. This opinion is yet firmly maintained by the *ancient Flemingians*, or *rigid* Anabaptiſts; but has, long ſince, been renounced by all the other ſects of that denomination [*d*]. II. The more auſtere Mennonites, like their forefathers, not only animadvert, with the moſt unrelenting ſeverity, upon actions manifeſtly criminal, and evidently repugnant to the divine laws, but alſo treat, in the ſame manner, the ſmalleſt marks of an internal propenſity to the pleaſures of ſenſe, or of a diſpoſition to comply with the cuſtoms of the world. They condemn, for example, elegant dreſs, rich furniture, every thing, in a word, that looks like ornament, or ſurpaſſes the bounds of abſolute neceſſity. Their conduct alſo to offenders is truly mercileſs; for they expel them from the church without previous admonition, and never temper the rigour of their judgments by an equitable conſideration of the infirmities of nature in this imperfect ſtate. The other Mennonites are by no means chargeable with this ſeverity towards their offending brethren; they exclude none from their communion but the obſtinate contemners of the divine laws; nor do they proceed to this extremity even with regard to ſuch, until repeated admonitions have proved ineffectual to reform them.—III. The more rigid Mennonites look upon thoſe that are excommunicated as the peſts of ſociety, who are to be avoided upon all occaſions, and to be baniſhed from all the comforts of ſocial intercourſe. Neither the voice of Nature, nor the ties of blood, are allowed to plead in their behalf, or to procure them the ſmalleſt degree of indulgence. In ſuch a caſe the exchange of good offices, the ſweets of friendly converſation, and the mutual effuſions of tenderneſs and love, are cruelly ſuſpended, even between parents and children, huſbands and wives, and alſo in all the other endearing relations of human life.—But the more moderate branches of this community have wiſely rejected this unnatural diſcipline, and look upon the honour and ſanctity of the church to be ſufficiently vindicated, when its members avoid a cloſe and particular intimacy with thoſe who have been expelled from its communion. IV. The rigid Anabaptiſts enjoin it as an obligation upon their diſciples, and the members of their community, to waſh the feet of their gueſts as a token of brotherly love and affection, and in obedience to the example of CHRIST, which they ſuppoſe, in this caſe, to have the force of a poſitive command; and hence they are ſometimes called *Podoniptæ*. But the other *Mennonites* deny that CHRIST meant, in this inſtance of his goodneſs and condeſcenſion, to recommend this cuſtom to the imitation of his followers, or to give his example, in this caſe, the authority of a poſitive precept.

---

[c] This is the account that is given of the opinion of Menno by Herman Schyn, in his *Plenior Deduct. Hiſt. Mennonit.* p. 164, 165. which other writers repreſent in a different manner. After an attentive peruſal of ſeveral paſſages in the writings of Menno, where he profeſſedly handles this very ſubject, it appears to me more than probable, that he inclined to the opinion attributed to him in the text, and that it was in this ſenſe only, that he ſuppoſed Christ to be clothed with a *divine* and *celeſtial* body. For that may, without any impropriety, be called *celeſtial* and *divine*, which is produced immediately, in conſequence of a *creating* act, by the Holy Ghoſt. It muſt however be acknowledged, that Menno does not ſeem to have been unchangeably wedded to this opinion. For in ſeveral places he expreſſes himſelf ambiguouſly on this head, and even ſometimes falls into inconſiſtencies. From hence, perhaps, it might not be unreaſonable to conclude, that he renounced, indeed, the common opinion concerning the origin of Christ's human nature; but was pretty much undetermined with reſpect to the hypotheſis, which, among many that were propoſed, it was proper to ſubſtitute in its place. ☞ See Fueslini *Centuria* I. *Epiſtolar. a Reformator. Helveticis ſcriptar.* p. 383.—Be that as it may, Menno is generally conſidered as the author of this opinion concerning the origin of Christ's body, which is ſtill embraced by the more rigid part of his followers. It appears probable, nevertheleſs, that this opinion was much older than his time, and was only adopted by him with the other tenets of the Anabaptiſts. As a proof of this, it may be obſerved, that Bolandus, in his Poem, entitled, *Motus Monaſterienſes*, lib. x. v. 49. plainly declares, that many of the Anabaptiſts of *Munſter* (who certainly had not been inſtructed by Menno) held this very doctrine in relation to Christ's incarnation:

Eſſe (Chriſtum) *Deum ſtatuunt alii, ſed corpore carnem,*
Humanam ſumto ſuſtinuiſſe negant:
At Diam mentem, tenuis quaſi fauce canalis,
Per Mariæ *corpus virginis iſſe ferunt.*

[*d*] Many writers are of opinion, that the *Waterlandians*, of all the other Anabaptiſts, ſhewed the ſtrongeſt propenſity to adopt the doctrine of MENNO, relating to the origin of CHRIST's body. See *Hiſtoire des Anabaptiſtes*, p. 223.—*Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 200. But that theſe writers are miſtaken, is abundantly manifeſt from the public *Confeſſion of Faith* of the *Waterlandians*, compoſed by RIES. See alſo, for a further refutation of this miſtake, HERM. SCHYN, *Deductio Plenior Hiſtor. Mennonit.* p. 165.

The ſtate of learning and philoſophy among the Anabaptiſts.

XIX. The Anabaptiſts, however divided on other ſubjects, were agreed in their notions of learning and philoſophy, which, in former times, they unanimouſly conſidered as the peſts of the Chriſtian church, and as highly detrimental to the progreſs of true religion and virtue. Hence it happened, that among a conſiderable number of writers who, in this century, employed their pens in the defence of that ſect, there is none whoſe labours bear any inviting marks of learning or genius. The rigid *Mennonites* perſevere ſtill in the barbarous ſyſtem of their anceſtors, and, neglecting totally the improvement of the mind and the culture of the ſciences, devote themſelves

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART II.

entirely to trade, manual induſtry, and the mechanic arts. The *Waterlandians*, indeed, are honourably diſtinguiſhed from all the other Anabaptiſts in this, as well as in many other reſpects. For they permit ſeveral members of their community to frequent the public univerſities, and there to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of languages, hiſtory, antiquities, and more eſpecially of phyſic, whoſe uſefulneſs and importance they do not pretend to deny; and hence it happens, that in our times, ſo many paſtors among the Mennonites aſſume the title and profeſſion of phyſicians. Nay more; it is not unuſual to ſee Anabaptiſts of this more humane and moderate claſs engaged even in philoſophical reſearches, on the excellence and utility of which their eyes are, at length, ſo far opened, as to make them acknowledge their importance to the well-being of ſociety. It was, no doubt, in conſequence of this change of ſentiment that they have erected, not long ago, a public ſeminary of learning at *Amſterdam*, in which there is always a perſon of eminent abilities choſen as profeſſor of philoſophy: But, though theſe moderate Anabaptiſts acknowledge the benefit which may be derived to civil ſociety from the culture of philoſophy and the ſciences, yet they ſtill perſevere ſo far in their ancient prejudices, as to conſider theology as a ſyſtem that has no connexion with them; and, conſequently, they are of opinion, that, in order to preſerve it pure and untainted, the utmoſt caution muſt be uſed not to blend the dictates of philoſophy with the doctrines of religion. It is farther to be obſerved, that, in the preſent times, even the *Flemiſh*, or *rigid* Anabaptiſts begin gradually to diveſt themſelves of their antipathy to learning, and allow their brethren to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of languages, hiſtory, and the other ſciences.

XX. That

Their diviſion into a multitude of ſects.

XX. That ſimplicity and ignorance, of which the ancient Anabaptiſts boaſted, as the guardians of their piety and the ſources of their felicity, contributed principally to thoſe diviſions and ſchiſms that reigned among them, from even their firſt riſe, in a degree unknown and unexperienced in any other Chriſtian community. This will appear evident to ſuch as enquire, with the ſmalleſt attention, into the more immediate cauſes of their diſſenſions. For it is obſervable, that their moſt vehement conteſts had not for their object any difference in opinion concerning the doctrines or myſteries of religion, but generally turned upon matters relating to the conduct of life, on what was *lawful*, *decent*, *juſt*, and *pious* in actions and manners, and what, on the contrary, was to be conſidered as *criminal* or *unſeemly*. Theſe diſputes were a natural conſequence of their favourite principle, that *holineſs* of life, and *purity* of manners, were the authentic *marks* of the true church. But the misfortune lay here, that, being ignorant themſelves, and under the guidance of perſons whoſe knowledge was little ſuperior to theirs, they were unacquainted with the true method of determining, in a multitude of caſes, what was *pious*, *laudable*, and *lawful*, and what was *impious*, *unbecoming*, and *criminal*. The criterion they employed for this purpoſe was neither the deciſion of right reaſon, nor the authority of the divine laws, accurately interpreted; ſince their ignorance rendered them incapable of uſing theſe means of arriving at the truth. They judged, therefore, of theſe matters by the ſuggeſtions of fancy, and the opinions of others. But as this method of diſcerning between right and wrong, decent and indecent, was extremely uncertain and precarious, and could not but produce a variety of deciſions, according to the different feelings, fancies, tempers, and capacities of different perſons, hence naturally aroſe diverſity of ſentiments, debates, and conteſts of various kinds. Theſe debates produced ſchiſms and diviſions, which are never more eaſily excited, nor more obſtinately fomented and perpetuated, than where ignorance, the true ſource of bigotry, prevails.

The firſt ſolid ſettlement of the Mennonites in the United Provinces.

XXI. The Mennonites, after having been long in an uncertain and precarious ſituation, obtained a fixed and unmoleſted ſettlement in the United Provinces, under the ſhade of a legal toleration procured for them by WILLIAM, prince of *Orange*, the glorious founder of Belgic liberty. This illuſtrious chief, who acted from principle in allowing liberty of conſcience and worſhip to Chriſtians of different denominations, was moreover engaged, by gratitude, to favour the Mennonites, who had aſſiſted him, in the year 1572, with a conſiderable ſum of money, when his coffers were almoſt exhauſted [*e*]. The fruits, however, of this toleration, were not immediately enjoyed by all the Anabaptiſts that were diſperſed through the different provinces of the riſing republic; for, in ſeveral places, both the civil magiſtrates and the clergy made a long and obſtinate oppoſition to the will of the prince in this matter; particularly in the province of *Zealand* and the city of *Amſterdam*, where the remembrance of the plots the Anabaptiſts had laid, and the tumults they had excited, was ſtill freſh in the minds of the people [*f*]. This oppoſition, indeed, was in a great meaſure conquered before the concluſion of this century, partly by the reſolution and influence of WILLIAM the Firſt, and his ſon MAURICE, and partly by the exemplary conduct of the Mennonites, who manifeſted their zealous attachment to the republic on ſeveral occaſions, and redoubled, inſtead of diminiſhing, the precautions that might remove all grounds of ſuſpicion to their advantage, and take from their adverſaries every pretext which could render their oppoſition juſtifiable. But it was not before the following century, that their liberty and tranquillity were fixed upon ſolid foundations, when, by a *Confeſſion of Faith*, publiſhed in the year 1626, they cleared themſelves from the imputation of thoſe pernicious and deteſtable errors that had been laid to their charge [g].

[*e*] See BRANDT, *Hiſtorie der Reformatie in de Nederlande*, vol. i. p. 525, 526.—*Ceremonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, tom. iv. p. 201.

[*f*] BRANDT, *loc. cit.* book xi. p. 555. 586, 587. 609, 610. book xiv. p. 780. book xvi. p. 811.

The Engliſh Anabaptiſts.

XXII. The ſect, in *England*, which rejects the cuſtom of baptizing infants, are not diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Anabaptiſts*, but by that of *Baptiſts*. It is, however, probable, that they derive their origin from the German and Dutch Mennonites; and that, in former times, they adopted their doctrine in all its points. That, indeed, is by no means the caſe at preſent; for the Engliſh Baptiſts differ, in many things, both from the ancient and modern Mennonites. They are divided into two ſects. One of which is diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of *General* or *Arminian Baptiſts*, on account of their oppoſition to the doctrine of abſolute and unconditional decrees; and the other by that of *Particular* or *Calviniſtical Baptiſts*, from the ſtriking reſemblance of their religious ſyſtem to that of the Preſbyterians, who have CALVIN for their chief [h]. The Baptiſts of this latter ſect ſettled chiefly at *London*, and in the towns and villages adjacent; and they have departed ſo far from the tenets of their anceſtors, that, at this day, they retain no more of the peculiar doctrines and inſtitutions of the Mennonites, than the adminiſtration of baptiſm by immerſion, and the refuſal of that ſacrament to infants, and thoſe of tender years. And conſequently they have none of thoſe ſcruples relating to oaths, war, and the functions of magiſtracy, that ſtill remain among even the moſt rational part of the modern Mennonites. They obſerve in their congregations the ſame rules of government, and the ſame method of worſhip, that are followed by the Preſbyterians, and their community is under the direction of men eminent for their piety and learning [*i*]. From their Confeſſion of Faith, that was publiſhed in the year 1643, it appears plainly, that their religious ſentiments were the ſame then that they are at this day [*k*].

---

[g] See HERM. SCHYN, *Plenior Deductio Hiſtor. Mennonit.* cap. iv. p. 79.

[h] See WHISTON's *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, vol. ii. p. 461.

The opinions of the General and Particular Anabaptiſts in *England*.

XXIII. The *General* Baptiſts, or, as they are called by ſome, the *Antipædobaptiſts*, are diſperſed in great numbers through ſeveral counties of *England*, and are, for the moſt part, perſons of mean condition, and almoſt totally deſtitute of learning and knowledge. This latter circumſtance will appear leſs ſurpriſing, when it is conſidered, that, like the ancient Mennonites, they profeſs a contempt of erudition and ſcience. There is much latitude in their ſyſtem of religious doctrine, which conſiſts in ſuch vague and general principles, as render their communion acceſſible to Chriſtians of almoſt all denominations. And, accordingly, they tolerate, in fact, and receive among them, perſons of every ſect, even Socinians and Arians; nor do they reject any from their communion who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, and receive the Holy Scriptures as the ſource of truth, and the rule of faith [l]. They agree with the *Particular* Baptiſts in this circumſtance, that they admit to baptiſm adult perſons only, and adminiſter that ſacrament by dipping or total immerſion; but they differ from them in another reſpect, even in their repeating the adminiſtration of baptiſm to thoſe who had received it, either in a ſtate of infancy, or by aſperſion, inſtead of dipping; for if the common accounts may be believed, the *Particular Baptiſts* do not carry matters ſo far. The following ſentiments, rites, and tenets, are alſo peculiar to the former: I. After the manner of the ancient Mennonites, they look upon their ſect as the only true Chriſtian church, and conſequently ſhun, with the moſt ſcrupulous caution, the communion of all other religious ſocieties. II. They dip only once, and not three times, as is practiſed elſewhere, the candidates for baptiſm, and conſider it as a matter of indifference, whether that ſacrament be adminiſtered in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, or in that of CHRIST alone. III. They adopt the doctrine of MENNO with reſpect to the *Millenium*, or thouſand years reign of the ſaints with CHRIST upon earth: And IV. many of them embrace his particular opinion concerning the origin of Chriſt's body [*m*]. V. They look upon the precept of the apoſtles, prohibiting the uſe of blood, and *things ſtrangled* [*n*], as a law that was deſigned to be in force in all ages and periods of the church. VI. They believe that the ſoul, from the moment that the body dies until its reſurrection at the laſt day, remains in a ſtate of perfect inſenſibility. VII. They uſe the ceremony of extreme unction. And to omit matters of a more trifling nature, VIII. ſeveral of them obſerve the Jewiſh as well as the Chriſtian ſabbath [*o*]. Theſe Baptiſts have three different claſſes of eccleſiaſtical governors, *biſhops*, *elders*, and *deacons*; the firſt of theſe, among whom there have been ſeveral learned men [*p*], they modeſtly call *meſſengers* [*q*], as St. JOHN is known to have ſtyled that Order, in the book of the *Revelations*.

[*i*] See a German work, compoſed by ANT. WILLIAM BOHM, under the title of the *Hiſtory of the Reformation in England*, p. 151. 473. 536. 1152.

[*k*] *Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. vi. p. 2.

---

[l] This appears evidently from their *Confeſſion of Faith*, which appeared firſt in the year 1660, was republiſhed by Mr. WHISTON, in the *Memoirs of his Life*, vol. ii. p. 561. and is drawn up with ſuch latitude, that, with the removal and alteration of a few points *, it may be adopted by Chriſtians of all denominations †. Mr. WHISTON, though an Arian, became a member of this Baptiſt community, which, as he thought, came neareſt to the ſimplicity of the primitive and apoſtolic age. The famous Mr. EMLYN, who was perſecuted on account of his Socinian principles, joined himſelf alſo to this ſociety, and died in their communion.

☞ * *Viz.* thoſe relating to *Univerſal Redemption*, the *Perſeverance of the Saints*, *Election* and *Reprobation*, which are illuſtrated entirely on Arminian principles, and conſequently cannot be embraced by rigid Calviniſts; not to mention the points relating to Baptiſm, which are the diſtinctive marks of this ſect.

☞ † Our author does not certainly mean to include Roman-catholics in this large claſs, for then his aſſertion would not be true.

The Davidiſts, or David-Georgians.

XXIV. Before we conclude the Hiſtory of the Anabaptiſts, it may not be improper to mention a very ſingular and ridiculous ſect that was founded by DAVID GEORGE, a native of *Delft*, and a member of that community. This enthuſiaſt, after having laid the foundation of the ſect of the *Davidiſts*, or *David-Georgians*, deſerted the Anabaptiſts, and removed to *Baſil* in *Switzerland*, in the year 1544, where he changed his name, and by the liberality and ſplendor that attended his

---

☞ [*m*] To wit, that the body of Jeſus was not derived from the ſubſtance of the bleſſed Virgin, but *created* in her womb by an omnipotent act of the holy Spirit.

[*n*] ACTS, XV. 29.

[*o*] Theſe accounts of the doctrine of the Baptiſts are taken from WALL'S *Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm*; and from the ſecond volume of WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life*, p. 465, &c.

[*p*] See WHISTON'S *Memoirs of his Life*, tom. ii. p. 466. as alſo CROSBY'S *Hiſtory of the Engliſh Baptiſts*, publiſhed in four volumes 8vo, in the year 1728.

[*q*] St. JOHN calls them the *angels of the churches*; the word *angel* (in Greek ἄγγελος) ſignifies properly an *envoy* or *meſſenger*.

opulence, joined to his probity and purity of manners, acquired a very high degree of eſteem, which he preſerved till his death. The luſtre of his reputation was, however, but tranſitory; for, ſoon after his deceaſe, which happened in the year 1556, his ſon-in-law, NICHOLAS BLESDYCK, charged him with having maintained the moſt blaſphemous and peſtilential errors. The ſenate of *Baſil,* before whom this accuſation was brought, being ſatisfied with the evidence by which it was ſupported, pronounced ſentence againſt the deceaſed heretic, and ordered his body to be dug up and to be publicly burnt. And, indeed, nothing more horridly impious and extravagant can poſſibly be conceived, than the ſentiments and tenets of this fanatic, if they were really ſuch as they have been repreſented, either by his accuſers or his hiſtorians. For he is ſaid to have given himſelf out for the Son of God, the Fountain of divine wiſdom, to have denied the exiſtence of angels, good and evil, of heaven and hell, and to have rejected the doctrine of a future judgment; and he is alſo charged with having trampled upon all the rules of decency and modeſty with the utmoſt contempt [r]. In all this, however, it is very poſſible, that there may be much exaggeration. The enthuſiaſt in queſtion, though a man of ſome natural genius, was, nevertheleſs, totally deſtitute of learning of every kind, and had ſomething obſcure, harſh, and illiberal in his manner of expreſſion, that gave too much occaſion to an unfavourable interpretation of his religious tenets. That he had both more ſenſe and more virtue than is generally imagined, appears manifeſtly, not only from his numerous writings, but alſo from the ſimplicity and candour that were viſible in the temper and ſpirit of the diſciples he left behind him, of whom ſeveral are yet to be found in *Holſtein*, *Frieſland*, and other countries [*s*]. He deplored the decline of vital and practical religion, and endeavoured to reſtore it among his followers; and in this he ſeemed to imitate the example of the more moderate Anabaptiſts. But the exceſſive warmth of an irregular imagination threw him into illuſions of the moſt dangerous and pernicious kind, and ſeduced him into a perſuaſion that he was honoured with the gift of divine inſpiration, and had celeſtial viſions conſtantly preſented to his mind. Thus was he led to ſuch a high degree of fanaticiſm, that, rejecting as mean and uſeleſs the external ſervices of piety, he reduced religion to contemplation, ſilence, and a certain frame or habit of ſoul, which it is equally difficult to define and to underſtand. The ſoaring *Myſtics* and the viſionary *Quakers* may, therefore, if they pleaſe, give David George a diſtinguiſhed rank in their enthuſiaſtical community.

---

[r] See NIC. BLESDYCKII *Hiſtoria Davidis Georgii à* JACOBO REVIO *edita*; as alſo the life of the ſame Fanatic, written in the German language, by STOLTERFORTH. Among the modern writers, ſee ARNOLD's *Kirchen-und Ketzer Hiſtorie,* tom. i. p. 750. tom. ii. p. 534 & 1183. in which there are ſeveral things that tend to clear the character of DAVID. See alſo HENR. MORI *Enthuſiaſmus Triumphatus,* ſect. xxxiii. p. 23. — And the documents I have publiſhed in relation to this matter, in the *Hiſtory of Servetus,* p. 425.

The *Family of Love* founded by Henry Nicholas.

XXV. Henry Nicholas, a *Weſtphalian*, one of the intimate companions of this fanatic, though ſomewhat different from him in the nature of his enthuſiaſm, and alſo in point of genius and character, founded a ſect in *Holland*, in the year 1555, which he called the *Family of Love*. The principles of this ſect were afterwards propagated in *England*, and produced no ſmall confuſion in both nations. The judgment that has been formed with reſpect to David George may be applied with truth, at leaſt in a great meaſure, to his aſſociate NICHOLAS, who, perhaps, would have prevented a conſiderable part of the heavy reproaches with which he has been loaded, had he been endowed with a degree of genius, diſcernment, and knowledge, ſufficient to enable him to expreſs his ſentiments with perſpicuity and elegance. Be that as it may, the character, temper, and views of this man may be learned from the ſpirit that reigned in his flock [*t*]. As to his pretenſions, they were, indeed, viſionary and chimerical; for he maintained, that he had a commiſſion from heaven, to teach men that the eſſence of religion conſiſted in the feelings of *divine love*; that all other theological tenets, whether they related to objects of faith, or modes of worſhip, were of no ſort of moment; and conſequently, that it was a matter of the moſt perfect indifference, what opinions chriſtians entertained concerning the divine nature, provided their hearts burned with the pure and ſacred flame of piety and love. To this, his main doctrine, NICHOLAS may have probably added other odd fancies, as always is the caſe with thoſe innovators, who are endued with a warm and fruitful imagination; to come, however, at a true notion of the opinions of this enthuſiaſt, it will be much wiſer to conſult his own writings, than to depend entirely upon the accounts and refutations of his adverſaries [*u*].

[*s*] See Jo. Molleri *Introduct. in Hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ*, P. II. p. 116. & *Cimbriæ Literatæ*, tom. i. p. 422.

[*t*] See JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controverſ.* lib. vi. p. 393. —ARNOLD, *Kirchen-und Ketzer Hiſtorie*, p. 746.—BOHM'S *Hiſtory of the Reformation in England* (written in German), book iv. ch. v. p. 541.

[*u*] The moſt learned of all the authors who wrote againſt the *Family of Love*, was Dr. HENRY MORE, in his *Grand Explanation of the Myſtery of Godlineſs*, &c. book vii chap. 12—18. GEORGE FOX, the founder of the ſect of Quakers, inveighed alſo ſeverely againſt this ſeraphic *Family*, and called them a motley tribe of Fanatics, becauſe they took oaths, danced, ſung, and made merry. See SHEWELL'S *Hiſtory of the Quakers*, book iii. p. 88, 89. 344.

CHAP. IV.

The HISTORY *of the* SOCINIANS.

The denomination and origin of this ſect.

I. THE *Socinians* are ſaid to have derived this denomination from the illuſtrious family of the *Sozzini*, which flouriſhed a long time at *Sienna* in *Tuſcany*, and produced ſeveral great and eminent men, and among others LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOZINUS, who are commonly ſuppoſed to have been the founders of this ſect. The former was the ſon of MARIANUS, a famous lawyer, and was himſelf a man of uncommon genius and learning; to which he added, as his very enemies are obliged to acknowledge, the luſtre of a virtuous life, and of unblemiſhed manners. Being forced to leave his country, in the year 1547, on account of the diſguſt he had conceived againſt popery, he travelled through *France*, *England*, *Holland*, *Germany*, and *Poland*, in order to examine the religious ſentiments of thoſe who had thrown off the yoke of *Rome*, and thus at length to come at the truth. After this he ſettled at *Zurich*, where he died in the year 1562, before he had arrived at the fortieth year of his age [*w*]. His mild and gentle diſpoſition rendered him averſe from whatever had the air of contention and diſcord. He adopted the Helvetic confeſſion of faith, and profeſſed himſelf a member of the church of *Switzerland*; but this did not engage him to conceal entirely the doubts he had formed in relation to certain points of religion, and which he communicated, in effect, by letter, to ſome learned men, whoſe judgment he reſpected, and in whoſe friendſhip he could confide [x]. His ſentiments were indeed propagated, in a more public manner, after his death; ſince FAUSTUS, his nephew and his heir, is ſuppoſed to have drawn, from the papers he left behind him, that religious ſyſtem upon which the ſect of the Socinians was founded.

[*w*] CLOPPENBURG, *Diſſertatio de origine et progreſſu Socinianiſmi.*—JO. HORNBECK, *Summa Controverſiarum*, p. 563.—JO. HENR. HOTTINGER, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* tom. ix. p. 417.

The term Socinian bears different ſignifications.

II. It is, however, to be obſerved, that this denomination does not always convey the ſame ideas, ſince it is ſuſceptible of different ſignifications, and is, in effect, uſed ſometimes in a more ſtrict and proper, and at others in a more improper and extenſive ſenſe. For, according to the uſual manner of ſpeaking, all are termed *Socinians*, whoſe ſentiments bear a certain affinity to the ſyſtem of SOCINUS; and they are more eſpecially ranked in that claſs, who either boldly deny, or artfully explain away, the doctrines that aſſert the *Divine Nature* of CHRIST, and a *Trinity* of perſons in the Godhead. But, in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe, they only are deemed the members of this ſect, who embrace wholly, or with a few exceptions, the form of theological doctrine, which FAUSTUS SOCINUS either drew up himſelf or received from his uncle, and delivered to the *Unitarian* brethren, or Socinians, in *Poland* and *Tranſylvania* [y].

The origin of Socinianiſm.

III. The origin of *Socinianiſm* may be traced to the earlieſt period of the Reformation. For ſcarcely ly had that happy revolution in the ſtate of religion taken place, when a ſet of men, fond of extremes, and conſequently diſpoſed to look upon as erroneous whatever had hitherto been taught and profeſſed in the church of *Rome*, began to undermine the doctrine of CHRIST's *Divinity*, and the other truths that are connected with it, and propoſed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. The efforts of theſe men were oppoſed with united zeal and vigilance by the Romiſh, Reformed, and Lutheran churches; and their deſigns were ſo far diſconcerted, as to prevent their forming themſelves and their followers into a regular and permanent ſect. So early as the year 1524, the *divinity* of CHRIST was openly denied by LEWIS HETZER, one of the wandering and fanatical *Anabaptiſts*, who, about three years afterwards, was put to death at *Conſtance* [z]. There were not wanting among the firſt Anabaptiſts, ſeveral perſons who entertained the opinions of HETZER; though it would be manifeſtly un-

---

[x] ZANCHIUS, *Præf. ad Libr. de tribus Elohim.*—BEZA, *Epiſt. Volum.* ep. lxxxi. p. 167. Certain writings are attributed to him by SANDIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Antitrinitar.* p. 18. but it is very doubtful whether he was the real author of them, or not.

[y] We have, hitherto, no complete or accurate hiſtory either of the ſect called Socinians, or of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS its founders; nor any ſatisfactory account of thoſe who laboured principally with them, and, after them, in giving a permanent and ſtable form to this community. For the accounts

---

accounts we have of the Socinians, and their principal doctors, from HORNBECK (1), CALOVIUS (2), CLOPPENBURG (3), SANDIUS (4), LUBIENIECIUS (5), and LAUTERBACH (6), are far from being proper to ſatisfy the curioſity of thoſe, who deſire ſomething more than a vague and ſuperficial knowledge of this matter. The Hiſtory of Socinianiſm, that was publiſhed at *Paris* by LAMI in the year 1723, is a wretched compilation from the moſt common-place writers on that ſubject; it is alſo full of errors, and is loaded with a variety of matters that have no ſort of relation to the hiſtory of SOCINUS, or to the doctrine he taught. The very learned and laborious LA CROZE promiſed in his *Diſſertations Hiſtoriques*, tom. i. p. 142. a complete Hiſtory of Socinianiſm, from its origin to the preſent times, but did not fulfil this intereſting engagement.

[z] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.*—JO. BAPT. OTTIUS, *Annal. Anabaptiſt.* p. 50.—BREITINGERI *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 391. tom. vi. p. 100. 479.

(1) In his *Socinianiſm. Confutat.* vol. i.—(2) In his *Opera Anti-Sociniani.*—(3) In his *Diſſertat. de origine et progreſſu Socinianiſmi*, tom. ii. opp.—(4) In his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.tariorum.*—(5) In his *Hiſtoria Reformationis Polonicæ.*—(6) In his *Ariano-Sociniſmus*, publiſhed in German at *Francfort* in the year 1725.

fair to lay theſe opinions to the charge of the whole community. But it was not only from that quarter that erroneous opinions were propagated in relation to the points already mentioned; others ſeemed to have been ſeized with the contagion, and it manifeſted itſelf from day to day in ſeveral countries. JOHN CAMPANUS, a native of *Juliers*, diſſeminated at *Wittemberg* and other places, various tenets of an heretical aſpect; and taught, among other things, that the *Son was inferior to the Father*, and that the *Holy Ghoſt* was not the title of a *divine perſon*, but a *denomination* uſed to denote the *nature* of the *Father* and of the *Son*; and thus did this innovator revive, in a great meaſure, the errors of the ancient Arians [a]. A doctrine of a ſimilar kind was propagated, in the year 1530, in *Switzerland*, *Augſburgh*, and among the Griſons, by a perſon, whoſe name was CLAUDIUS, who, by his oppoſition to the doctrine of CHRIST's divinity, excited no ſmall commotions in theſe countries [b]. But none of theſe new teachers were ſo far encouraged by the number of their followers, or the indulgence of their adverſaries, as to be in a condition to form a regular ſect.

Michael Servetus.

IV. The attempts of MICHAEL SERVEDE [c], or SERVETUS, a Spaniſh phyſician, were much more alarming to thoſe who had the cauſe of true religion at heart, than the feeble and impotent efforts of the innovators now mentioned. This man, who has made ſuch a noiſe in the world, was born at *Villa Nueva*, in the kingdom of *Arragon*, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the ſuperiority of his genius, and had made a conſiderable progreſs in various branches of ſcience. In the years 1531 and 1532, he publiſhed, in Latin, his *Seven books concerning the errors that are contained in the doctrine of the Trinity*, and his *Two Dialogues* on the ſame ſubject, in which he attacked, in the moſt audacious manner, the ſentiments adopted by far the greateſt part of the Chriſtian church, in relation to the *Divine Nature*, and a *Trinity* of perſons in the *Godhead*. Some years after this he travelled into *France*, and, after a variety of adventures, ſettled at *Vienne* in *Dauphiné*, where he applied himſelf, with ſucceſs, to the practice of phyſic. It was here, that, letting looſe the reins of his warm and irregular imagination, he invented that ſtrange ſyſtem of theology, which was printed, in a clandeſtine manner, in the year 1553, under the title of *Chriſtianity reſtored*. The man ſeemed to be ſeized with a paſſion for reforming (in his way), and many things concurred to favour his deſigns, ſuch as the fire of his genius, the extent of his learning, the power of his eloquence, the ſtrength of his reſolution, the obſtinacy of his temper, and an external appearance, at leaſt, of piety, that rendered all the reſt doubly engaging. Add to all this, the protection and friendſhip of many perſons of weight, in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, which SERVETUS had obtained by his talents and abilities both natural and acquired; and it will appear that few innovators have ſet out with a better proſpect of ſucceſs. But, notwithſtanding theſe ſignal advantages, all his views were totally diſappointed by the vigilance and ſeverity of

---

[a] See the Diſſertation *de Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario*, in the *Amœnitates Literariæ* of the very learned SCHELHORNIUS, tom. xi. p. 1—92.

[b] See SCHELHORNII *Diſſert. Epiſtol. de Mino Celſo Senenſi Claudio item Allobrage, homine Fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoſte, Ulmæ* 1748, in 4to.—JAC. BREITINGERI *Muſeum Helvetic.* tom. vii. p. 667.—JO. HALLERUS, *Epiſtol.* in JO. CONRAD. FUESLIN, *Centuria Epiſtolar. Viror. Eruditor.* p. 140.

[c] By taking away the laſt ſyllable of this name (I mean the Spaniſh termination *de)* there remains *Serve*, which, by placing differently the letters that compoſe it, makes *Reves*. SERVETUS aſſumed this latter name in the title-pages of all his books. He alſo called himſelf ſometimes *Michael Villanovanus*, or *Villanovanus* alone, after the place of his nativity, omitting the name of his family.

CALVIN, who, when SERVETUS had eſcaped from his priſon at *Vienne*, and was paſſing through *Switzerland*, in order to ſeek refuge in *Italy*, cauſed him to be apprehended at *Geneva*, in the year 1553, and had an accuſation of blaſphemy brought againſt him before the council [*d*]. The iſſue of this accuſation was fatal to SERVETUS, who, adhering reſolutely to the opinions he had embraced, was, by a public ſentence of the court, declared an obſtinate heretic, and, in conſequence thereof, condemned to the flames. For it is obſervable, that, at this time, the ancient laws that had been enacted againſt heretics by the emperor FREDERIC II., and had been ſo frequently renewed after his reign, were ſtill in vigour at *Geneva*. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that this learned and ingenious ſufferer was worthy of a better fate; though it is certain, on the other hand, that his faults were neither few nor trivial; ſince it is well known, that his exceſſive arrogance was accompanied with a malignant and contentious ſpirit, an invincible obſtinacy of temper, and a conſiderable portion of fanaticiſm [*e*].

V. The

☞ [*d*] This accuſation was brought againſt SERVETUS by a perſon, who lived in CALVIN's family as a ſervant; and this circumſtance diſpleaſed many.

☞ [*e*] Dr. MOSHEIM refers the reader here, in a note, to an ample and curious hiſtory of SERVETUS, compoſed by him in the German language, of which the firſt edition was publiſhed at *Helmſtadt*, in 4to, in the year 1748, and the ſecond, with conſiderable additions, at the ſame place, the year following. Thoſe who are not acquainted with the German language, will find a full account of this ſingular man, and of his extraordinary hiſtory, in a Latin diſſertation, compoſed under the inſpection of Dr. MOSHEIM, and publiſhed at *Helmſtadt* under the following title: *Hiſtoria Michaelis Serveti, quam, Præſide Jo. Laur. Moſheimeo, Abbate*, &c. *placido Doctorum examini publice exponit* HENRICUS AB ALLWAERDEN. There is an accurate hiſtory of this unhappy man in the firſt volume of the work, entitled, *Memoirs of Literature, containing a Weekly Account of the State of Learning, both at home and abroad*, The doctrine of Servetus.

V. The religious ſyſtem that SERVETUS had ſtruck out, of a wild and irregular fancy, was, indeed, ſingular in the higheſt degree. The greateſt part of it was a neceſſary conſequence of his peculiar notions concerning the *univerſe*, the *nature of God*, and the *nature of things*, which were equally ſtrange and chimerical. Thus it is difficult to unfold, in a few words, the doctrine of this unhappy man; nor, indeed, would any detail render it intelligible in all its branches. He took it into his head that the true and genuine doctrine of CHRIST had been entirely loſt, even before the council of *Nice*; and he was, moreover, of opinion, that it had never been delivered with a ſufficient degree of preciſion and perſpicuity in any period of the church. To theſe extravagant aſſertions he added another ſtill more ſo, even that he himſelf had received a commiſſion from above to reveal anew this divine doctrine, and to explain it to mankind. His notions with reſpect to the Supreme Being, and a Trinity of perſons in the Godhead, were obſcure and chimerical beyond all meaſure, and amounted in general to the following

---

abroad. This was compoſed by Monſieur DE LA ROCHE, and was afterwards augmented by him, and tranſlated into French in his *Bibliotheque Angloiſe*, tom. ii. part I. article vii. p. 76.— There is alſo an account of SERVETUS given by MACKENZIE, in the firſt volume of his *Lives and Characters of the moſt eminent Writers of the Scots nation*, which was publiſhed at *Edinburgh* in the year 1708. To theſe we may add *An Impartial Hiſtory of* SERVETUS, &c. written by an anonymous author, and publiſhed at *London* in 1724.

It is impoſſible to juſtify the conduct of CALVIN in the caſe of SERVETUS, whoſe death will be an indelible reproach upon the character of that great and eminent Reformer. The only thing that can be alleged, not to efface, but to diminiſh his crime, is, that it was no eaſy matter for him to diveſt himſelf at once of that perſecuting ſpirit, which had been ſo long nouriſhed and ſtrengthened by the popiſh religion in which he was educated. It was a remaining portion of the ſpirit of popery in the breaſt of CALVIN that kindled his unchriſtian zeal againſt the wretched SERVETUS.

ing propoſitions: "That the *Deity*, before the creation of the world, had produced within himſelf two *perſonal repreſentations*, or *manners of exiſtence* [*f*], which were to be the *medium* of intercourſe between him and mortals, and by whom, conſequently, he was to reveal his will, and to diſplay his mercy and beneficence to the children of men; that theſe two repreſentatives were the *Word* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; that the former was united to the man CHRIST, who was born of the Virgin MARY by an omnipotent act of the divine will; and that, on this account, CHRIST might be properly called *God*; that the *Holy Spirit* directed the courſe, and animated the whole ſyſtem of nature; and more eſpecially produced in the minds of men wiſe councils, virtuous propenſities, and divine feelings; and, finally, that theſe two *Repreſentations* were to ceaſe after the deſtruction of this terreſtrial globe, and to be abſorbed into the *ſubſtance* of the *Deity*, from whence they had been formed." This is, at leaſt, a general ſketch of the doctrine of SERVETUS, who, however, did not always explain his ſyſtem in the ſame manner, nor take any pains to avoid inconſiſtencies and contradictions; and who frequently expreſſed himſelf in ſuch ambiguous terms, that it is extremely difficult to learn from them his true ſentiments. His ſyſtem of morality agreed in many circumſtances with that of the *Anabaptiſts*; whom he alſo imitated in cenſuring, with the utmoſt ſeverity, the cuſtom of *Infant-Baptiſm*.

Other Anti-Trinitarians.

VI. The pompous plans of Reformation, that had been formed by SERVETUS, were not only diſconcerted, but even fell into oblivion, after the death

---

☞ [*f*] Theſe *repreſentations*, or *manners of exiſtence*, SERVETUS alſo called *œconomies*, *diſpenſations*, *diſpoſitions*, &c. for he often changed his terms in unfolding his viſionary ſyſtem.

death of their author. He was, indeed, according to vulgar report, ſuppoſed to have left behind him a conſiderable number of diſciples; and we find in the writings of the doctors of this century, many complaints and apprehenſions that ſeem to confirm this ſuppoſition, and would perſuade us, that SERVETUS had really founded a ſect; yet, when this matter is attentively examined, there will appear juſt reaſon to doubt, whether this man left behind him any one perſon that might properly be called his true diſciple. For thoſe who were denominated *Servetians* by the theological writers of this century, not only differed from SERVETUS in many points of doctrine, but alſo varied widely from him in his doctrine of the Trinity, which was the peculiar and diſtinguiſhing point of his theological ſyſtem. VALENTINE GENTILIS, a Neapolitan, who ſuffered death at *Bern*, in the year 1566, adopted the Arian hypotheſis, and not that of SERVETUS, as many writers have imagined; for his only error conſiſted in this, that he conſidered the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, as ſubordinate to the *Father* [g]. Nearly allied to this, was the doctrine of MATTHEW GRIBALDI, a lawyer, whom a timely death, in the year 1566, ſaved from the ſeverity of an eccleſiaſtical tribunal, that was ready to pronounce ſentence againſt him on account of his errors; for he ſuppoſed the *divine nature* divided into *three eternal ſpirits*, which were diſtinguiſhed from each other, not only by *number*, but alſo by *ſubordination* [h]. It is not ſo eaſy to determine the particular charge that was brought againſt ALCIAT, a native of *Piedmont*, and SYLVESTER TELLIUS, who were baniſhed from the city and territory of *Geneva*, in the year 1559; nor do we know, with any degree of certainty, the errors that were embraced by PARUTA, LEONARDI, and others [i], who were ranked among the followers of SERVETUS. It is, however, more than probable, that none of the perſons now mentioned were the diſciples of SERVETUS, or adopted the hypotheſis of that viſionary innovator. The ſame thing may be affirmed with reſpect to GONESIUS, who is ſaid to have embraced the doctrine of that unhappy man, and to have introduced it into *Poland* [k]; for, though he maintained ſome opinions that really reſembled it in ſome of its points; yet his manner of explaining the myſtery of the Trinity was totally different from that of SERVETUS.

---

[g] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article GENTILIS.—SPON. *Hiſt. de Geneve*, livr. iii. tom. ii. p. 80.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 26.—LAMY, *Hiſtoire du Socinianiſme*, part II. ch. vi. p. 251.—FUESL. *Reformations Beytrage*, tom. v. p. 381.

[h] SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 17.—LAMY, *loc. cit.* part II. ch, vii. p. 257.—SPON, *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85. not.—HALERUS, in *Muſeo Tigurino*, tom. ii. p. 114.

Erroneous accounts of the origin of Socinianiſm.

VII. It is evident that none of the perſons, now mentioned, profeſſed that form or ſyſtem of theological doctrine, that is properly called *Socinianiſm*, the origin of which is, by the writers of that ſect, dated from the year 1546, and placed in *Italy*. Theſe writers tell us, that, in this very year, above forty perſons eminently diſtinguiſhed by their learning and genius, and ſtill more by their generous zeal for truth, held ſecret aſſemblies, at different times, in the territory of *Venice*, and particularly at *Vicenza*, in which they deliberated concerning a general reformation of the received ſyſtems of religion, and, in a more eſpecial manner, undertook to refute the peculiar doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinians. They tell us further, that the principal members of this clandeſtine ſociety, were LÆLIUS, SOCINUS, ALCIAT, OCHINUS, PARUTA, and GENTILIS; that their deſign was divulged, and their meetings diſcovered, by the temerity and imprudence of ſome of their aſſociates; that two of them were apprehended and put to death; while the reſt, being diſperſed, ſought a refuge in *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Moravia*, and other countries, and that SOCINUS, after having wandered up and down in ſeveral parts of *Europe*, went into *Poland*, firſt in the year 1551, and afterwards in 1558, and there ſowed the ſeeds of his doctrine, which, in proceſs of time, grew apace, and produced a rich and abundant harveſt [*l*]. Such is the account of the origin of Socinianiſm, that is generally given by the writers of that ſect. To aſſert that it is, in every circumſtance, fictitious and falſe, would perhaps be going too far; but, on the other hand, it is eaſy to demonſtrate that the ſyſtem of religion, commonly called *Socinianiſm*, was neither invented nor drawn up in thoſe meetings at *Venice* and *Vicenza* that have now been mentioned [*m*].

---

[i] For an account of theſe, and other perſons of the ſame claſs, ſee SANDIUS, LAMY, and alſo LUBIENIECIUS, his *Hiſtoria Reformat. Polonicæ*, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 96.—There is a particular and ample account of ALCIAT given by BAYLE, in the firſt volume of his *Dictionary*; ſee alſo SPON, *loc. cit.* tom. ii. p. 85, 86.

[k] This is affirmed upon the authority of WISSOWATIUS and LUBIENIECIUS; but the very words of the latter will be ſufficient to ſhew us upon what grounds. Theſe words (*Hiſt. Reformat. Polon.* cap. vi. p. 111.) are as follows: *Is Serveti ſententiam de præ-eminentia patris in patriam attulit, eamque non diſſimulavit*, i. e. GONESIUS *introduced into* Poland *the opinion embraced by* SERVETUS *in relation to the pre-eminence of the Father, and was by no means ſtudious to conceal it.* Who now does not ſee, that, if it was the *pre-eminence of the Father* that GONESIUS maintained, he muſt have differed conſiderably from SERVETUS, whoſe doctrine removed all *real* diſtinction in the divine nature? The reader will do well to conſult SANDIUS (*loc. cit.* p. 40.) concerning the ſentiments of GONESIUS; ſince it is from this writer, that LAMY has borrowed the greateſt part of what he has advanced in his *Hiſtoire de Socinianiſme*, tom. ii, chap. x. p. 278.

[*l*] See the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 18 & 25. of SANDIUS, who mentions ſome writings that are ſuppoſed to have been publiſhed by the clandeſtine ſociety of pretended Reformers at *Venice* and *Vicenza*; though the truth of this ſuppoſition is extremely dubious;—ANDR. WISSOWATII *Narratio quomodo in Polonia Reformati ab Unitariis ſeparati ſunt*, which is ſubjoined to the *Biblioth.* of SANDIUS, p. 209, 210.—The reader may likewiſe conſult LUBIENIECIUS, *Hiſtor. Reformat. Polon.* lib. ii. cap. i. p. 38. who intimates, that he took this account of the origin of Socinianiſm from the manuſcript *Commentaria* of BUDZINUS, and his *Life* of LÆLIUS SOCINUS. See alſo SAM. PRZIPCOVIUS, *in Vita Socini*.

[*m*] See GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hiſtoria Crypto-Socinianiſmi Altorfini*, cap. ii. § xli. p. 321. note.—This writer ſeems to think that the inquiries that have hitherto been made into this affair are by no means ſatisfactory; and he therefore wiſhes that ſome men of learning, equal to the taſk, would examine the ſubject anew.—This, indeed, were much to be wiſhed. In the mean time, I ſhall venture to offer a few obſervations, which may perhaps contribute to caſt ſome light upon this matter. That there was, in reality, ſuch a ſociety as is mentioned in the text, is far from being improbable. Many circumſtances and relations prove ſufficiently, that immediately after the Reformation had taken place in *Germany*, ſecret aſſemblies were held, and meaſures propoſed, in ſeveral provinces that were ſtill under the juriſdiction of *Rome*, with a view to combat the errors and ſuperſtition of the times. It is alſo, in a more eſpecial manner, probable, that the territory of *Venice* was the ſcene of theſe deliberations; ſince it is well known, that a great number of the Venetians at this time, though they had no perſonal attachment to LUTHER, approved, nevertheleſs, of his deſign of reforming the corrupt ſtate of religion, and wiſhed well to every attempt that was made to reſtore Chriſtianity to its native and primitive ſimplicity. It is farther highly credible, that theſe aſſemblies were interrupted and diſperſed by the vigilance of the papal emiſſaries, that ſome of their members were apprehended and put to death, and that the reſt ſaved themſelves by flight. All this is probable enough; but it is extremely improbable, nay utterly incredible, that all the perſons, who are ſaid to have been preſent at theſe aſſemblies, were really ſo. And I therefore adopt willingly the opinion of thoſe who affirm, that many perſons, who, in after-times, diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the multitude by oppoſing the doctrine of *Trinity in Unity*, were conſidered as members of the Venetian ſociety, by ignorant writers, who looked upon that ſociety as the ſource and nurſery of the whole *Unitarian* ſect. It is certain, for inſtance, that OCHINUS is erroneouſly placed among the members

VIII. While, therefore, we reject this inaccurate account of the matter under conſideration, it is

The real origin of Socinianiſm.

---

bers of the famous ſociety now mentioned; for, not to inſiſt upon the circumſtance, that it is not ſufficiently clear whether he was really a Socinian or not, it appears undeniably, from the *Annales Capucinorum* of BOVERIUS, as well as from other unqueſtionable teſtimonies, that he left *Italy* ſo early as the year 1543, and went from thence to *Geneva*. See a ſingular book, entitled, *La Guerre Seraphique, ou l'Hiſtoire des perils qu'a courus la Barbe des Capuchins*, livr. iii. p. 191. 216.—What I have ſaid of OCHINUS may be confidently affirmed with reſpect to LÆLIUS SOCINUS, who, though reported to have been at the head of the ſociety now under conſideration, was certainly never preſent at any of its meetings. For how can we ſuppoſe that a young man, only one-and-twenty years old, would leave the place of his nativity, repair to *Venice* or *Vicenza*, and that without any other view than the pleaſure of diſputing freely on certain points of religion *? Or how could it happen, that a youth of ſuch unexperienced years ſhould acquire ſuch a high degree of influence and authority, as to obtain the firſt rank, and the principal direction, in an aſſembly compoſed of ſo many eminently learned and ingenious men? Beſides, from the *Life of* LÆLIUS, which is ſtill extant, and from other teſtimonies of good authority, it is eaſy to ſhew, that it was the deſire of improvement, and the hope of being aided, in his inquiries after truth, by the converſation of learned men in foreign nations, that induced him to leave *Italy*, and not the apprehenſion of perſecution and death, as ſome have imagined. It is alſo certain, that he returned into his native country afterwards, and, in the year 1551, remained ſome time at *Sienna*, while his father lived at *Bologna*. See his letter to BULLINGER, in the *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. v. p. 489. Now ſurely it cannot eaſily be imagined, that a man in his ſenſes would return to a country from whence, but a few years before, he had been obliged to fly, in order to avoid the terrors of a barbarous inquiſition and a violent death.

But, waving this queſtion for a moment, let us ſuppoſe all the accounts, we have from the Socinians, concerning this famous aſſembly of *Venice* and *Vicenza*, and the members of which it was compoſed, to be true and exact; yet it remains to be proved, that the Socinian ſyſtem of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that aſſembly. This the Socinian writers maintain; and this, as the caſe appears to me, may be ſafely

☞ * Is ſuch a ſuppoſition really ſo abſurd? Is not a ſpirit of enthuſiaſm, or even an uncommon degree of zeal, adequate to the production of ſuch an effect?

is incumbent upon us to ſubſtitute a better in its place; and, indeed, the origin and progreſs of the Socinian doctrine ſeem eaſy to be traced out by ſuch as are acquainted with the hiſtory of the church during this century. There were certain ſects and doctors, againſt whom the zeal, vigilance, and ſeverity of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calviniſts, were united, and, in oppoſing whoſe ſettlement and progreſs, theſe three communions, forgetting their diſſenſions, joined their moſt vigorous counſels and endeavours. The objects of

---

denied. For the Socinian doctrine is undoubtedly of much later date than this aſſembly; it alſo paſſed through different hands, and was, during many years, reviewed and corrected by men of learning and genius, and thus underwent various changes and improvements before it was formed into a regular, permanent, and connected ſyſtem. To be convinced of this, it will be ſufficient to caſt an eye upon the opinions, doctrines, and reaſonings, of ſeveral of the members of the famous ſociety, ſo often mentioned; which vary in ſuch a ſtriking manner, as ſhew manifeſtly that this ſociety had no fixed views, nor had ever agreed upon any conſiſtent form of doctrine. We learn, moreover, from many circumſtances in the life and tranſactions of LÆLIUS SOCINUS, that this man had not, when he left *Italy*, laid the plan of a regular ſyſtem of religion; and it is well known, that, for many years afterwards, his time was ſpent in doubting, inquiring, and diſputing; and that his ideas of religious matters were extremely fluctuating and unſettled. So that it ſeems probable to me, that the man died in this ſtate of heſitation and uncertainty, before he had reduced his notions to any conſiſtent form. As to GRIBALDI and ALCIAT, who have been already mentioned, it is manifeſt that they inclined towards the Arian ſyſtem, and did not entertain ſuch low ideas of the perſon and dignity of JESUS CHRIST, as thoſe that are adopted among the Socinians. From all this it appears abundantly evident, that theſe Italian Reformers, if their famous ſociety ever exiſted in reality (which I admit here as a probable ſuppoſition rather than as a fact ſufficiently atteſted) were diſperſed and obliged to ſeek their ſafety in a voluntary exile, before they had agreed about any regular ſyſtem of religious doctrine. So that this account of the origin of Socinianiſm is rather imaginary than real, though it has been inconſiderately adopted by many writers. FUESLIN has alleged ſeveral arguments againſt it in his German work, entitled *Reformations Beytragen*, tom. iii. p. 327.

their common averſion, were the *Anabaptiſts*, and thoſe who denied the *Divinity* of CHRIST, and a *Trinity* of Perſons in the Godhead. To avoid the unhappy conſequences of ſuch a formidable oppoſition, great numbers of both claſſes retired into *Poland*, from this perſuaſion, that in a country whoſe inhabitants were paſſionately fond of freedom, religious liberty could not fail to find a refuge. However, on their firſt arrival, they proceeded with circumſpection and prudence, and explained their ſentiments with much caution and a certain mixture of diſguiſe, not knowing ſurely what might happen, nor how far their opinions would be treated with indulgence. Thus they lived in peace and quiet during ſeveral years, mixed with the Lutherans and Calviniſts, who had already obtained a ſolid ſettlement in *Poland*, and who admitted them into their communion, and even into the aſſemblies where their public deliberations were held. They were not, however, long ſatisfied with this ſtate of conſtraint, notwithſtanding the privileges with which it was attended; but, having inſinuated themſelves into the friendſhip of ſeveral noble and opulent families, they began to act with more ſpirit, and even to declare, in an open manner, their oppoſition to certain doctrines that were generally received among Chriſtians. Hence aroſe violent conteſts between them and the Swiſs, or Reformed churches, with which they had been principally connected. Theſe diſſenſions drew the attention of the government, and occaſioned, in the year 1565, a reſolution of the diet of *Petrikow*, ordering the innovators to ſeparate themſelves from the churches already mentioned, and to form a diſtinct congregation or ſect [*n*]. Theſe founders of the Socinian church were commonly called *Pinczovians*, from the town in which the heads of their ſect reſided. Hitherto, indeed, they had not carried matters ſo far as they did afterwards; for they profeſſed chiefly the Arian doctrine concerning the divine nature, maintaining that the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt* were two diſtinct natures, begotten by *God the Father*, and ſubordinate to him [o].

[*n*] LAMY, *Hiſtoire du Socinianiſme*, part I. chap. vi. &c. p. 16.—STOINII *Epitome Originis Unitariorum in Polonia*, apud SANDIUM,

The progreſs of Socinianiſm.

IX. The *Unitarians*, being thus ſeparated from the other religious ſocieties in *Poland*, had many difficulties to encounter, both of an internal and external kind. From without, they were threatened with a formidable proſpect ariſing from the united efforts of Catholics, Lutherans, and Calviniſts, to cruſh their infant ſect. From within, they dreaded the effects of inteſtine diſcord, which portended the ruin of their community before it could arrive at any meaſure of ſtability or conſiſtence. This latter apprehenſion was too well grounded; for, as yet, they had agreed upon no regular ſyſtem of principles, which might ſerve as a centre and bond of union. Some of them choſe to perſevere in the doctrine of the Arians,

---

SANDIUM, p. 183.—GEORG. SCHOMANNI *Teſtamentum*, apud *eundem*, p. 194.—ANDR. WISSOWATIUS *de Separatione Unitar. a Reformatis*, ibid. p. 211, 212.—LUBIENIECIUS, *Hiſtor. Reformat. Polonicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 111. cap. viii. p. 144. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 158.

[o] This will appear abundantly evident to all ſuch as conſult, with a proper degree of attention, the writers mentioned in the preceding note. It is unqueſtionably certain, that all thoſe, who then called themſelves *Unitarian Brethren*, did not entertain the ſame ſentiments concerning the Divine Nature. Some of the moſt eminent doctors of that ſect adopted the notions relating to the *perſon* and *dignity* of CHRIST, that were, in after-times, peculiar to the Socinians; the greateſt part of them, however, embraced the Arian ſyſtem, and affirmed, that our bleſſed Saviour was created before the formation of the world, by *God the Father*, to whom he was much inferior, nevertheleſs, in dignity and perfection.

and to proceed no further; and theſe were called *Farnovians* [*p*]. Others, more adventurous, went much greater lengths, and attributed to CHRIST almoſt no other rank or dignity than thoſe of a divine meſſenger, and of a true prophet. A third claſs, diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of *Budneians* [*q*], went ſtill further; declaring that JESUS CHRIST was born in an ordinary way, according to the general law of nature, and that, conſequently, he was no proper object of divine worſhip or adoration [*r*]. There were alſo among theſe people ſeveral fanatics, who were deſirous of introducing into the ſociety the diſcipline of the enthuſiaſtic Anabaptiſts; ſuch as a community of goods, an equality of ranks, and other abſurdities of the ſame nature [*s*]. Such were the diſagreeable and perilous circumſtances in which the *Unitarians* were placed, during the infancy of their ſect, and which, no doubt, rendered their ſituation extremely critical and perplexing. But they were happily extricated out of theſe difficulties by the dexterity and reſolution of certain of their doctors, whoſe efforts were crowned with ſingular ſucceſs, on account of the credit and influence they had obtained in *Poland*. Theſe Unitarian doctors ſuppreſſed, in a little time, the factions that threatened the ruin of their community, erected flouriſhing congregations at *Cracow*, *Lublin*, *Pinczow*, *Luck*, *Smila* [*t*] (a town belong-

---

☞ [*p*] For a more particular account of the *Farnovians*, ſee § xxii. of this chapter.

☞ [*q*] See the part of this chapter referred to in the preceding vote.

[*r*] *Vita Andr. Wiſſowatii* in SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 226.—As alſo SANDIUS in *Simone Budnæo*, p. 54.

[*s*] LUBIENIECII *Hiſt. Reform. Polon.* lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 240.

[*t*] MART. ADELT, *Hiſtoria Arianiſmi Smiglienſis*, *Ged.* 1741, in 8vo.

ing to the famous DUDITH [u],) and in ſeveral other places both in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, and obtained the privilege of printing their productions, and thoſe of their brethren, without moleſtation or reſtraint [w]. All theſe advantages were crowned by a ſignal mark of liberality and munificence, they received from Jo. SIENIENIUS, palatine of *Padolia*, who gave them a ſettlement in the city of *Racow*, which he had himſelf built, in the

---

☞ [u] This DUDITH, who was certainly one of the moſt learned and eminent men of the ſixteenth century, was born at *Buda*, in the year 1533; and after having ſtudied in the moſt famous univerſities, and travelled through almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, was named to the biſhoprick of *Tinia* by the Emperor FERDINAND, and made privy counſellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius, and the ſtudy of the ancient orators, acquired ſuch a maſterly and irreſiſtible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried every thing before him. In the council, where he was ſent in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he ſpoke with ſuch energy againſt ſeveral abuſes of the church of *Rome*, and particularly againſt the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, ſolicited the emperor to recal him. FERDINAND complied; but, having heard DUDITH's report of what paſſed in that famous council, he approved of his conduct, and rewarded him with the biſhoprick of *Chonat*. He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of *Hungary*, and reſigned his biſhoprick; the emperor, however, ſtill continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, but he treated it with contempt. Tired of the fopperies and ſuperſtitions of the church of *Rome*, he retired to *Cracow*, where he embraced the proteſtant religion publicly, after having been for a good while its ſecret friend. It is ſaid, that he ſhewed ſome inclination towards the Socinian ſyſtem. Some of his friends deny this; others confeſs it, but maintain that he afterwards changed his ſentiments in that reſpect. He was well acquainted with ſeveral branches of philoſophy and the mathematics, with the ſciences of phyſic, hiſtory, theology, and the civil law. He was ſuch an enthuſiaſtical admirer of CICERO, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole works of that immortal author. He had ſomething majeſtic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and eaſy, and his benevolence warm and extenſive.

[w] SANDII *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 201.

year 1569, in the diſtrict of *Sendomir* [x]. This extraordinary favour was peculiarly adapted to better the ſtate of the Unitarians, who were, hitherto, diſperſed far and wide in the midſt of their enemies. And accordingly they now looked upon their religious eſtabliſhment as permanent and ſtable, and preſumed ſo far upon their good fortune, as to declare *Racow* the centre of their community, where their diſtant and diſperſed members might unite their counſels, and hold their deliberations.

A ſummary view of the religion they profeſſed.

X. When they ſaw their affairs in this promiſing ſituation, the firſt thing that employed the attention and zeal of their doctors and ſpiritual rulers, was a tranſlation of the Bible into the Poliſh language, which was accordingly publiſhed in the year 1572. They had, indeed, before this, a Poliſh verſion of the ſacred writings, which they had compoſed, jointly with the Helvetic doctors, in the year 1565, while they lived in communion with that church. But after the breach of that communion, and the order they had received to ſeparate themſelves from the Reformed church, this Verſion loſt its credit among them, as it did not ſeem proper to anſwer their views [y]. After they had finiſhed their new Verſion, they drew up a ſummary of their religious doctrine, which was publiſhed at *Cracow*, in the year 1574, under the title of *Catechiſm*, or *Confeſſion* of the *Unitarians* [z]. The ſyſtem of religion that is contained in this Catechiſm, is remarkable for its ſimplicity, and is neither loaded

---

[x] SANDIUS, *loc. citat.* p. 201.—LUBIENIECIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 239.

[y] See a German work of RINGELTAUBE, entitled, *Von den Pohlniſchen Bibeln*, p. 90. 113. 142. in which there is a further account of the Poliſh interpretations of the Bible compoſed by Socinian authors.

[z] From this little performance, and indeed from it alone, we may learn with certainty the true ſtate of the Unitarian religion before FAUSTUS SOCINUS; and, nevertheleſs, I do not

with

---

not find that it has been ſo much as once quoted, or even mentioned, by any of the Socinian writers, by any hiſtorians who have given an account of their ſect, nor yet by any of the divines that have drawn the pen of controverſy againſt their religious ſyſtem. I am almoſt inclined to believe, that the Socinians (when, in proceſs of time, they had gained ground, acquired more dexterity in the management of their affairs, and drawn up a new, ſpecious, and artful ſummary of their doctrine) were prudent enough to deſire that this primitive Catechiſm ſhould diſappear, that it might not furniſh their adverſaries with an occaſion of accuſing them of inconſtancy in abandoning the tenets of their anceſtors, nor excite factions and diviſions among themſelves, by inducing any of their people to complain that they had deviated from the ancient ſimplicity of their firſt founders. Theſe reaſons, very probably, engaged the Socinian doctors to buy up all the copies they could find of this original *Confeſſion* or Catechiſm, with a view to bury it in oblivion. It will not, therefore, be improper to give here ſome account of the form and matter of this firſt Socinian Creed, which contained the doctrine of that ſect before the *Racovian Catechiſm* was compoſed. This account will throw new light upon a period and branch of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory that are highly intereſting. The original Catechiſm, now under conſideration, which is extremely rare, has the following title prefixed to it: *Catechiſm or Confeſſion of Faith of the Congregation aſſembled in* Poland, *in the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who was crucified and raiſed from the dead*—DEUTER. vi. *Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord our God is one God*—JOHN viii. 54. *It is my Father—of whom ye ſay that he is your God. Printed by Alexander Turobinus, born in the year of Chriſt, the Son of God,* 1574, in 12mo (1). We find, by a paſſage, at the end of the *Preface,* that this curious Catechiſm was printed at *Cracow*; for it is ſaid to have been publiſhed in that city, *in the year* 1574, *after the birth of Chriſt.* Now it is known that the *Unitarians* had, at that time, a Printing-houſe at *Cracow,* which was, ſoon after, removed to *Racow. Alexander Turobinus,* who is ſaid to have been the printer of this little production, is mentioned by SANDIUS (in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 51.) under the denomination of TUROBINCZYCK, which he

(1) The original title runs thus: *Catecheſis et Confeſſio fidei cœtus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jeſu Chriſti, Domini noſtri, crucifixi et reſuſcitati,* Deut. vi. *Audi, Iſrael, Dominus Deus noſter Deus unus eſt,* Johannis viii. *dicit Jeſus: Quem vos dicitis veſtrum eſſe Deum, eſt pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini, anno nati Jeſu Chriſti, filii Dei,* 1574, in 12mo.

undoubtedly

with ſcholaſtic terms nor ſubtile diſcuſſions; but it nevertheleſs breathes, in ſeveral places, the ſpirit

undoubtedly derived from *Turobin*, a town in the Palatinate of *Chelm*, in *Little* or *Red Ruſſia*, which was the place of his nativity. The author of this Catechiſm was the famous GEORGE SCHOMAN, as has been evidently proved from a piece, entitled, *Schomanni Teſtamentum* (2); and other circumſtances, by JO. ADAM MULLERUS, in his Diſſertation *De Unitariorum Catacheſi et Confeſſione omnium* (3). The *Preface*, which is compoſed in the name of the whole Congregation, begins with the following ſalutation: *To all thoſe who thirſt after eternal ſalvation*, the LITTLE and AFFLICTED FLOCK *in* Poland, *which is baptized in the name of Jeſus of Nazareth, ſendeth greeting: praying moſt earneſtly that grace and peace may be ſhed upon them by the one ſupreme God and Father, through his only begotten Son, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who was crucified* (4). After this general ſalutation, the *Prefacers* give an account of the reaſons that engaged them to compoſe and publiſh this Confeſſion. The principal of theſe reaſons was, the reproaches and aſperſions that were caſt upon the *Anabaptiſts*, in ſeveral places; from which we learn that, at this time, the denomination of *Anabaptiſts* was given to thoſe who, in after times, were called *Socinians*. The reſt of this *Preface* is employed in beſeeching the reader to be firmly perſuaded, that the deſigns of the *Congregation* are pious and upright, to read with attention, that he may judge with diſcernment, and, *abandoning the doctrine of Babylon, and the conduct and converſation of Sodom, to take refuge in the ark of Noah*, i. e. among the Unitarian Brethren.

In the beginning of the *Catechiſm* itſelf, the whole doctrine of Chriſtianity is reduced to ſix points. The firſt relates to the *Nature of God*, and his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*; the ſecond to *Juſtification*; the third to *Diſcipline*; the fourth to *Prayer*; the fifth to *Baptiſm*; and the ſixth to the *Lord's Supper*. Theſe ſix points are explained at length, in the following manner: Each point is defined and unfolded, in general terms, in one *queſtion* and *anſwer*, and is afterwards ſubdivided into its ſeveral branches in various *queſtions* and *anſwers*, in which its different parts are illuſtrated, and confirmed by texts of Scripture.

---

(2) This *Teſtament* is publiſhed by SANDIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* p. 51.

(3) The Diſſertation of MOLLERUS is to be found in a collection of pieces publiſhed by BARTHOLOMÆUS under the following title: *Fortgeſezten nutzlichen Ammerckungen von allerhand Materien*, part xxi. p. 758.

(4) *Omnibus ſalutem æternam ſitientibus, gratiam ac pacem ab uno illo altiſſimo Deo patre, per unigenitum ejus ſilium, Dominum noſtrum, Jeſum Chriſtum crucifixum, ex animo precatur* COETUS EXIGUUS ET AFFLICTUS *per Poloniam, in nomine ejuſdem Jeſu Chriſti Nazareni baptizatus.*

ture.

ſpirit of Socinianiſm, and that even in thoſe parts of it which its authors look upon as moſt import- ant

ture. From this it appears, at firſt ſight, that the primitive ſtate of Socinianiſm was a ſtate of real infancy and weakneſs, that its doctors were, by no means, diſtinguiſhed by the depth or accuracy of their theological knowledge, and that they inſtructed their flock in a ſuperficial manner, by giving them only ſome vague notions of certain leading doctrines and precepts of religion. In their definition of the *Nature of God*, with which this Catechiſm begins, the authors diſcover immediately their ſentiments concerning JESUS CHRIST, by declaring that he, together with all other things, is *ſubject* to the ſupreme Creator of the univerſe. It may alſo be obſerved, as a proof of the ignorance or negligence of theſe authors, that, in illuſtrating the nature and perfections of the Deity, they make not the leaſt mention of his *infinity*, his *omniſcience*, his *immenſity*, his *eternity*, his *omnipotence*, his *omnipreſence*, his *ſpirituality*, nor of thoſe other perfections of the divine nature that ſurpaſs the comprehenſion of finite minds. Inſtead of this, they characterize the Supreme Being only by his *wiſdom*, his *immortality*, his *goodneſs*, and unbounded *dominion* and empire over the creatures. By this it would ſeem, that, even in this early period of Socinianiſm, the rulers of that ſect had adopted it as a maxim, that nothing *incomprehenſible* or *myſterious* was to be admitted into their religious ſyſtem.—Their erroneous notion concerning JESUS CHRIST is expreſſed in the following terms: *Our mediator before the throne of God is a man, who was formerly promiſed to our fathers by the prophets, and in theſe latter days was born of the ſeed of David, and whom God the Father, has made Lord and Chriſt, that is, the moſt perfect prophet, the moſt holy prieſt, and the moſt triumphant king, by whom he created the* NEW *world* (5), *by whom he has ſent peace upon earth, reſtored all things, and reconciled them to himſelf; and by whom alſo he has beſtowed eternal life upon his elect; to the end that, after the ſupreme God, we ſhould believe in him, adore and invoke him, hear his voice, imitate his example, and find, in him, reſt to our ſouls* (6). It is here worthy of note, that, al-

---

(5) This expreſſion is remarkable; for theſe doctors maintained, that theſe declarations of Scripture, which repreſent the world as formed by Chriſt, do not relate to the viſible world, but to the reſtoration of mankind to virtue and happineſs by the Son of God. They invented this interpretation to prevent their being obliged to acknowledge the divine glory and creating power of Chriſt.

(6) *Eſt homo, mediator noſter apud Deum, patribus olim per prophetas promiſſus, et ultimis tandem temporibus ex Davidis ſemine natus, quem Deus pater fecit Dominum et Chriſtum, hoc eſt, perfectiſſimum prophetam, ſanctiſſimum ſacerdotem, invictiſſimum regem, per quem mundum creavit, omnia reſtauravit, ſecum reconciliavit, pacificavit, et vitam æternam electis ſuis donavit: ut in illum, poſt Deum altiſſimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invocemus, audiamus, pro modulo noſtro imitamur, et, in illo, requiem animabus noſtris inveniamus.*

though

ant and fundamental. Nor will this appear ſurpriſing to thoſe who conſider, that the papers of LÆLIUS

---

though they call CHRIST *a moſt holy prieſt*, and juſtify this title by citations from Scripture, yet they no where explain the nature of that *prieſthood*, which they attribute to him.—With reſpect to the *Holy Ghoſt*, they plainly deny his being a *divine perſon*, and repreſent him as nothing more than a divine quality, or virtue, as appears from the following paſſage: *The Holy Ghoſt is the energy or perfection of God, whoſe fulneſs God the Father beſtowed upon his only begotten Son, our Lord, that we, becoming his adopted children, might receive of his fulneſs* (7).—They expreſs their ſentiments concerning *Juſtification* in the enſuing terms: *Juſtification conſiſts in the remiſſion of all our paſt ſins, through the mere grace and mercy of God, in and by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, without our merits and works, and in conſequence of a lively faith, as alſo in the certain hope of life eternal, and the true and unfeigned amendment of our lives and converſations, through the aſſiſtance of the divine ſpirit, to the glory of God the Father, and the edification of our neighbours* (8). As by this inaccurate definition *Juſtification* comprehends in it amendment and obedience, ſo in the explication of this point our authors break in upon the following one which relates to *Diſcipline*, and lay down a ſhort ſummary of moral doctrine, which is contained in a few precepts, and expreſſed, for the moſt part, in the language of ſcripture. There is this peculiarity in their moral injunctions, that they prohibit the *taking of oaths* and the *repelling of injuries*. As to what regards *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline*, they define it thus: *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline conſiſts in calling frequently to the remembrance of every individual, the duties that are incumbent upon them in admoniſhing, firſt privately, and afterwards, if this be ineffectual, in a public manner before the whole congregation, ſuch as have ſinned openly againſt God, or offended their neighbour; and, laſtly, in excluding from the communion of the church the obſtinate and impenitent, that, being thus covered with ſhame, they may be led to repentance, or, if they remain unconverted, may be damned eternally* (9). By their further

(7) *Spiritus ſanctus eſt virtus Dei. cujus plenitudinem dedit Deus pater filio ſuo unigenito, Domino noſtro, ut ex ejus plenitudine nos adoptivi acciperemus.*

(8) *Juſtificatio eſt ex mera gratia, per Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum, ſine operibus et meritis noſtris, omnium præteritorum peccatorum noſtrorum in viva fide remiſſio, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio et auxilio ſpiritus Dei vitæ noſtræ. non ſimulata, ſed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei patris noſtri et ædificationem proximorum noſtrorum.*

(9) *Diſciplina eccleſiaſtica eſt officii ſingulorum frequens commemoratio et peccantium contra Deum vel proximum primum privata, deinde etiam publica, coram toto cœtu, commonefactio, denique pertinacium a communione ſanctorum alienatio, ut pudore ſuffuſi convertantur, aut, ſi id nolint, æternum damnentur.*

explication

LÆLIUS SOCINUS, which he undoubtedly left behind him in *Poland*, were in the hands of many; and that, by the peruſal of them, the Arians, who had formerly the upper hand in the community of the Unitarians, were engaged to change their ſentiments concerning the nature and mediation of CHRIST.

explication of the point relating to *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline,* we ſee how imperfect and incomplete their notions of that matter were. For they treat, in the firſt place, concerning the government of the church, and its miniſters, whom they divide into *biſhops, deacons, elders,* and *widows.* After this, they enumerate, at length, the duties of huſbands and wives, old and young, parents and children, maſters and ſervants, citizens and magiſtrates, poor and rich, and conclude with what relates to the admoniſhing of offenders, and their excluſion from the communion of the church, in caſe of obſtinate impenitence. Their ſentiments concerning *Prayer* are, generally ſpeaking, ſound and rational. But in their notion of *Baptiſm* they differ from other Chriſtian churches in this, that they make it to conſiſt in *immerſion* or dipping, and *emerſion* or riſing again out of the water, and maintain that it ought not to be adminiſtered to any, but adult perſons. *Baptiſm,* ſay they, *is the immerſion into water, and the emerſion of one who believes in the Goſpel and is truly penitent, performed in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, or in the name of Jeſus Chriſt alone; by which ſolemn act the perſon baptized publicly acknowledgeth, that he is cleanſed from all his ſins, through the mercy of God the Father, by the blood of Chriſt, and the operation of the Holy Spirit; to the end that, being ingrafted into the body of Chriſt, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the image of the new and heavenly Adam, in the firm aſſurance of eternal life after the reſurrection* (10). The laſt point handled in this performance is the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,* of which the authors give an explication, that will be readily adopted by thoſe who embrace the doctrine of ZUINGLE on that head. At the end of this curious Catechiſm there is a piece, entitled, *Oeconomia Chriſtiana, ſeu Paſtoratus Domeſticus,* which contain a ſhort inſtruction to heads of families, ſhewing them how they ought to proceed in order to maintain and increaſe, in their houſes, a ſpirit of piety; in which alſo their

---

(10) *Baptiſmus eſt hominis Evangelio credentis et pœnitentiam agentis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, vel in nomine Jeſu Chriſti in aquam immerſio et emerſio, quâ publice profitetur, ſe gratia Dei Patris, in ſanguine Chriſti, opera Spiritus Sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum eſſe, ut, in corpus Chriſti inſertus, mortificet veterem Adamum et transformetur in Adamum illum cœleſtem, certus, ſe poſt reſurrectionem conſequuturum eſſe vitam æternam.*

CHRIST [a]. It is true, indeed, that the denomination of *Socinian* was not as yet known. Thoſe who were afterwards diſtinguiſhed by this title, paſſed in *Poland*, at the time of which we now ſpeak, under the name of *Anabaptiſts*, becauſe they admitted to baptiſm adult perſons only, and alſo rebaptized thoſe that joined them from other Chriſtian churches [b].

XI. The

---

devotion is aſſiſted by forms of prayer, compoſed for morning, evening, and other occaſions.

The copy of this Catechiſm, which is now before me, was given, in the year 1680, by MARTIN CHELMIUS, one of the moſt eminent and zealous Socinian doctors, to Mr. CHRISTOPHER HEILIGMIER, as appears by a long inſcription, written by the donor, at the end of the book. In this inſcription CHELMIUS promiſes his friend other productions of the ſame kind, provided he receives the preſent one kindly, and concludes with theſe words of St. PAUL; *God hath choſen the weak things of the world to confound the ſtrong.*

[a] This appears evidently from the following paſſage in SCHOMAN's *Teſtamentum* (publiſhed by SANDIUS, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.*), p. 194, 195. *Sub id fere tempus* (A. 1566.) *ex Rhapſodiis Lælii Socini quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei filium non eſſe ſecundam Trinitatis perſonam, patri coëſſentialem et coæqualem, ſed hominum Jeſum Chriſtum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex Virgine Maria natum, crucifixum, et reſuſcitatum: a quibus nos commoniti,* ſacras literas perſcrutari, *perſuaſi ſumus.* Theſe words ſhew plainly, that the Unitarians, or *Pinczovians*, as they were ſometimes called, had, before their ſeparation from the Reformed church in the year 1565, believed in a *Trinity* of ſome kind or other; and had not gone ſo far as totally to diveſt JESUS CHRIST of his divinity. SCHOMAN, now cited, was a doctor of great authority in this ſect; and he tells us, himſelf, that, at the diet of *Petricow*, in the year 1565, he defended the *unity of God the Father* againſt the Reformed, who maintained *the exiſtence of a threefold Deity*. We learn nevertheleſs from himſelf, that it was not till the year 1566, that a peruſal of the papers of LÆLIUS SOCINUS had engaged him to change his ſentiments, and to deny the *divine perſonality* of Chriſt. What then are we to conclude from hence? The concluſion is plainly this: that, before the year laſt mentioned, he and his *Pinczovian* flock were not Socinians, but Arians only.

[b] This the *Unitarians* acknowledge, in the *Preface* of their *Catechiſm*, as we have obſerved above; and it is confirmed

The proceedings of Fauſtus Socinus.

XI. The dexterity and perſeverance of FAUSTUS SOCINUS gave a new face to the ſect of the Unitarians, of which he became the zealous and induſtrious patron. He was a man of true genius, but of little learning; firm in his purpoſes, and ſteady in his meaſures; much inferior in knowledge to his uncle LÆLIUS, while he ſurpaſſed him greatly in courage and reſolution. This eminent ſectary, after having wandered through ſeveral countries of *Europe*, ſettled, in the year 1579, among the *Unitarians* in *Poland*, and at his arrival there ſuffered many vexations and much oppoſition from a conſiderable number of perſons, who looked upon ſome of his tenets as highly erroneous. And, indeed, it is evident, that the religious ſyſtem of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, which he is ſaid to have drawn from the papers of his uncle LÆLIUS, was much leſs remarkable for its ſimplicity than that of the *Unitarians*. He triumphed, however, at laſt, over all the difficulties that had been laid in his way, by the power of his eloquence, the ſpirit and addreſs that reigned in his compoſitions, the elegance and gentleneſs of his manners, the favour and protection of the nobility, which he had acquired by his happy talents and accompliſhments, and alſo by ſome lucky hits of fortune that favoured his enterprizes. By ſeizing the occaſions when it was prudent to yield, and improving the moments that demanded bold reſiſtance and firm reſolution, he ſtemmed dexterouſly and courageouſly the torrent of oppoſition, and beheld the *Unitarians* ſubmitting to his doctrine,

---

firmed by the writer of the *Epiſtola de Vita Andr. Wiſſowatii*, which is ſubjoined to the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trin.* of SANDIUS. This writer tells us, that his ſect were diſtinguiſhed by the denominations of *Anabaptiſts* and *Arians*; but that all other Chriſtian communities and individuals in *Poland* were promiſcuouſly called *Chrzeſciani*, from the word *Chrzeſt*, which ſignifies *Baptiſm*.

trine, which they had before treated with indignation and contempt. They, in effect, laid aſide all feuds and controverſies, and formed themſelves into one community under his ſuperintendency and direction [*c*].

The Unitarian religion changed by Socinus.

XII. Thus did SOCINUS introduce a conſiderable change into the ancient Unitarian ſyſtem, which, before his time, was ill-digeſted, ill expreſſed, and chargeable in many places with ambiguity and incoherence. He diſguiſed its inconſiſtencies, gave it an air of connexion, method, and elegance, and defended it with much more dexterity and art, than had ever been diſcovered by its former patrons [*d*]. And, accordingly, the affairs of the *Unitarians* put on a new face. Under the auſpicious protection of ſuch a ſpirited and inſinuating chief; the little flock, that had been hitherto deſtitute of ſtrength, reſolution, and courage, grew apace, and, all of a ſudden, aroſe to a high degree of credit and influence. Its number was augmented by proſelytes of all ranks and orders. Of theſe ſome were diſtinguiſhed by their nobility, others by their opulence, others by their addreſs, and many by their learning and eloquence. All theſe contributed, in one way or another, to increaſe the luſtre, and to advance the intereſts, of this riſing community, and to ſupport it againſt the multitude of adverſaries, which its remarkable proſperity and ſucceſs had raiſed up againſt it from all quarters; the rich maintained it by their liberality, the powerful by their patronage and protection, and the learned by their writings. But now the ſyſtem of the *Unitarians*, being thus changed and new-modelled, required a new confeſſion of faith to make known its principles, and give a clear and full account of its preſent ſtate. The ancient *Catechiſm*, which was no more than a rude and incoherent ſketch, was therefore laid aſide, and a new form of doctrine was drawn up by SOCINUS himſelf. This form was corrected by ſome, augmented by others, and reviſed by all the Socinian doctors of any note; and, having thus acquired a competent degree of

---

[*c*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article SOCINUS, tom. iv. p. 2741.—SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trin.* p. 64.—SAM. PRZYPCOPII *Vita Socini*, which is prefixed to the works of SOCINUS. —LAMY, *Hiſtoire de Socinianiſme*, part I. ch. xxiv. p. 101. part II. ch. xxii. p. 375, &c.

[*d*] Hence it appears, that the modern *Unitarians* are very properly called *Socinians*. For certainly the formation and eſtabliſhment of that ſect were entirely owing to the labours of LÆLIUS and FAUSTUS SOCINUS. The former, indeed, who was naturally timorous and irreſolute, died at *Zurich*, in the year 1562, in the communion of the Reformed church, and ſeemed unwilling to expoſe himſelf to danger, or to ſacrifice his repoſe, by founding a new ſect, that is, by appearing profeſſedly and openly in this enterprize. Beſides, many circumſtances concur to render it highly probable, that he did not finiſh the religious ſyſtem of which he had formed the plan, but died, on the contrary, in a ſtate of uncertainty and doubt with reſpect to ſeveral points of no ſmall importance. But, notwithſtanding all this, he contributed much to the inſtitution of the ſect now under conſideration. For he collected the materials that FAUSTUS afterwards digeſted and employed with ſuch dexterity and ſucceſs. He ſecretly and imperceptibly excited doubts and ſcruples in the minds of many, concerning ſeveral doctrines generally received among Chriſtians; and, by ſeveral arguments againſt the divinity of Chriſt, which he left behind him committed to writing, he ſo far ſeduced, even after his death, the Arians in *Poland*, that they embraced the communion and ſentiments of thoſe, who looked upon CHRIST as a mere man, created immediately, like ADAM,

ADAM, by God himſelf. What LÆLIUS had thus begun, FAUSTUS carried on with vigour, and finiſhed with ſucceſs. It is indeed difficult, nay ſcarcely poſſible, to determine preciſely, what materials he received from his uncle, and what tenets he added himſelf; that he added ſeveral is plain enough. This difficulty ariſes from hence, that there are few writings of LÆLIUS extant, and of thoſe that bear his name, ſome undoubtedly belong to other authors. We learn, however, from FAUSTUS himſelf, that the doctrine he propagated, with reſpect to the *perſon* of CHRIST, was, at leaſt the greateſt part of it, broached by his uncle LÆLIUS.

accuracy and perfection, was publiſhed under the title of the *Catechiſm of Racow*, and is ſtill conſidered as the *Confeſſion of Faith* of the whole ſect. An unexpected circumſtance crowned all the fortunate events that had happened to this ſect, and ſeemed to leave them nothing further to deſire; and this was the zealous protection of JACOBUS A SIENNO, to whom *Racow* belonged. This new patron, ſeparating himſelf from the Reformed church, in the year 1600, embraced the doctrine and communion of the Socinians, and about two years after, erected in his own city, which he declared their metropolis, a public ſchool, deſigned as a ſeminary for their church, to form its miniſters and paſtors [e].

The propagation of Socinianiſm in *Tranſylvania* and *Hungary*.

XIII. From *Poland*, the doctrine of SOCINUS made its way into *Tranſylvania*, in the year 1563, and that, principally, by the credit and influence of GEORGE BLANDRATA, a celebrated phyſician, whom SIGISMUND, at that time ſovereign of the country, had invited to his court, in order to the reſtoration of his health. BLANDRATA was a man of uncommon addreſs, had a deep knowledge of men and things, and was particularly acquainted with the manners, tranſactions, and intrigues of courts. He had brought with him a Socinian miniſter, whoſe name was FRANCIS DAVID, who ſeconded his efforts with ſuch zeal, that, by their united ſolicitations and labours, they engaged the prince, and the greateſt part of the nobility, in their cauſe, infected almoſt the whole province with their errors, and obtained, for the miniſters and members of their communion, the privilege of profeſſing and propagating their doctrines in a public manner. The *Batori*, indeed, who were afterwards choſen dukes of *Tranſylvania*, were, by no means, prejudiced in favour of the Socinians; but that ſect was grown ſo powerful by its numbers, and its influence, that they could not, in prudence, attempt to ſuppreſs it [*f*]. Such alſo was the caſe with the ſucceſſors of the *Batori*; they deſired ardently to extirpate this ſociety, but never could bring this deſire into execution; ſo that to this day the Socinians profeſs their religion publicly in this province, and, indeed, in it alone; and, relying on the protection of the laws, and the faith of certain treaties that have been made with them, have their churches and ſeminaries of learning, and hold their eccleſiaſtical and religious aſſemblies, though expoſed to perpetual dangers and ſnares from the vigilance of their adverſaries [*g*]. About the ſame time the Socinians endeavoured to form ſettlements in *Hungary* [*h*] and *Auſtria* [*i*]; but theſe attempts were defeated by the united and zealous oppoſition both of the Roman-catholic and Reformed churches.

---

[e] See WISSOWATII *Narratio de Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis*, p. 214.—LUBIENIECIUS, *Hiſtor. Reformatorum, Polon.* lib. iii. c. xii. p. 240.

In Holland and England.

XIV. No ſooner had the Socinians obtained a ſolid and happy ſettlement at *Racow*, but the dictates of zeal and ambition ſuggeſted to them views of a ſtill more extenſive nature. Encouraged by the protection of men in power, and the ſuffrages of men of learning and genius, they began to lay ſeveral plans for the enlargement of their community, and meditated nothing leſs than the propagation of their doctrine through all the ſtates of *Europe*. The firſt ſtep they took towards the execution of this purpoſe, was the publication of a conſiderable number of books, of which ſome were deſigned to illuſtrate and defend their theological ſyſtem, and others to explain, or rather to pervert, the ſacred writings into a conformity with their peculiar tenets. Theſe books, which were compoſed by the moſt ſubtile and artful doctors of the ſect, were printed at *Racow*, and diſperſed with the utmoſt induſtry and zeal through different countries [*k*]. They alſo ſent miſſionaries to ſeveral places, towards the concluſion of this century, as appears evident from authentic records, in order to make proſelytes, and to erect new congregations. Theſe miſſionaries ſeemed every way qualified to gain credit to the cauſe in which they had embarked, as ſome of them were diſtinguiſhed by the luſtre of their birth, and others by the extent of their learning, and the power of their eloquence; and yet, notwithſtanding theſe uncommon advantages, they failed, almoſt every where, in their attempts. A ſmall congregation was founded at *Dantzic*, which ſubſiſted, for ſome time, in a clandeſtine manner, and then gradually dwindled to nothing [*l*]. The firſt attempts to promote the cauſe of Socinianiſm in *Holland*, were made by a perſon whoſe name was ERASMUS JOHANNIS [*m*]. After him CHRIST-

---

[*f*] See SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 28. & 55.—PAULI DEBREZENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria*, p. 147.—MART. SCHMEIZELII *De Statu Eccleſ. Lutheranæ in Tranſylvania*, p. 55.—LAMY, *Hiſt. du Socinianiſme*, part I. ch. xiii. p. 46.—SALIG, *Hiſtor. Aug. Confeſſionis*, vol. ii. lib. vi. cap. vii. p. 847.

[*g*] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hiſtoria Crypto-Sociniſmi Altorſini*, cap. ii. p. 357. 359.

[*h*] DEBREZENI *Hiſtor. Eccleſ, Reform. in Hungaria*, p. 169.

[*i*] HENR. SPONDANI *Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad A.* 1568, n. xxiv. p. 704.

[*k*] A conſiderable number of theſe books were republiſhed together, in the year 1656, in one great collection, conſiſting of ſix volumes in *folio*, under the title of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*. There are, indeed, in this collection many pieces wanting, which were compoſed by the moſt eminent leaders of the ſect; but what is there publiſhed is, nevertheleſs, ſufficient to give the attentive reader a clear idea of the doctrine of the Socinians, and of the nature of their inſtitution as a religious community.

[*l*] GUSTAV. GEORG. ZELTNERI *Hiſt. Crypto-Sociniſmi Altorfini*, p. 199.

[*m*] SANDIUS, *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.

OPHER OSTOROD, and ANDREW VOIDIOVIUS, who were the main pillars of the ſect, uſed their utmoſt endeavours to gain diſciples and followers in that country; nor were their labours wholly unſucceſsful, though the zeal of the clergy, and the vigilance of the magiſtrates, prevented their forming any regular aſſemblies, and thus effectually checked their progreſs [*n*], and hindered their party from acquiring any conſiderable degree of ſtrength and ſtability [*o*]. Socinianiſm did not meet with a better reception in *Britain* than in *Holland*. It was introduced into *Germany* by ADAM NEUSER, and other emiſſaries, who infected the Palatinate with its errors, having entered into a league with the Tranſylvanians, at the critical period when the affairs of the Unitarians, in *Poland*, carried a dubious and unpromiſing aſpect. But this pernicious league was ſoon detected, and the ſchemes of its authors entirely blaſted and diſconcerted; upon which NEUSER went into *Turkey*, and enliſted among the Janizaries [*p*].

The main principle of Socinianiſm.

XV. Although the Socinians profeſs to believe that all our knowledge of divine things is derived ſolely from the Holy Scriptures; yet they maintain in reality, that the ſenſe of ſcripture is to be inveſtigated and explained by the dictates of right

---

☞ [*n*] BRANDT, in his Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Netherlands, tells us, that OSTOROD and VOIDIOVIUS were baniſhed, and that their books were condemned to be burnt publicly by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly the pile was raiſed, the executioner approached, and the multitude was aſſembled, but the books did not appear. The magiſtrates, who were curious to peruſe their contents, had quietly divided them among themſelves and their friends.

[*o*] ZELTNERUS, *Hiſt. Crypto-Sociniſmi*, &c. p. 31. & 178.

[*p*] BURCH. GOTT. STRUVII *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Palat.* cap. viii. § liii. p. 214.—ALTING. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Palat.* in MIEGII *Monum. Palat.* p. 266—337.—LA CROZE, *Diſſertations Hiſtoriques*, tom. i. p. 101. 127. compared with BERN. RAUPACHIUS, his *Preſbyterologia Auſtriaca*, p. 113. where there is an account of JOHN MATTHÆUS, who was concerned in theſe troubles.

reaſon, to which, of conſequence, they attribute a great influence in determining the nature, and unfolding the various doctrines of religion. When their writings are peruſed with attention, they will be found to attribute more to reaſon, in this matter, than moſt other Chriſtian ſocieties. For they frequently inſinuate artfully, nay ſometimes declare plainly, that the ſacred penmen were guilty of ſeveral miſtakes, from a defect of memory, as well as a want of capacity: that they expreſſed their ſentiments without either perſpicuity or preciſion, and rendered the plaineſt things obſcure by their pompous and diffuſe Aſiatic ſtyle; and that it was therefore abſolutely neceſſary to employ the lamp of human reaſon to caſt a light upon their doctrine, and to explain it in a manner conformable to truth. It is eaſy to ſee what they had in view by maintaining propoſitions of this kind. They aimed at nothing leſs than the eſtabliſhment of the following general rule, *viz.* that the hiſtory of the Jews and of JESUS CHRIST was indeed to be derived from the books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, and that it was not lawful to entertain the leaſt doubt concerning the truth of this hiſtory, and the authenticity of theſe books in general; but that the particular doctrines which they contain, were, nevertheleſs, to be underſtood, and explained in ſuch a manner as to render them conformable to the dictates of reaſon. According to this repreſentation of things, it is not the Holy Scripture, which declares clearly and expreſsly what we are to believe concerning the nature, counſels, and perfections of the Deity; but it is human reaſon, which ſhews us the ſyſtem of religion that we ought to ſeek in, and deduce from, the divine oracles.

The dangerous conſequences of this principle.

XVI. This fundamental principle of Socinianiſm will appear more dangerous and pernicious, when we conſider the ſenſe in which the word

Reaſon was underſtood by this ſect. The pompous title of *Right Reaſon* was given, by the Socinians, to that meaſure of intelligence and diſcernment, or, in other words, to that faculty of comprehending and judging, which we derive from nature. According to this definition, the fundamental rule of the Socinians neceſſarily ſuppoſes, that no doctrine ought to be acknowledged as true in its nature, or divine in its origin, all whoſe parts are not level to the comprehenſion of the human underſtanding; and that, whatever the Holy Scriptures teach concerning the perfections of God, his counſels and decrees, and the way of ſalvation, muſt be modified, curtailed, and filed down, in ſuch a manner, by the transforming power of art and argument, as to anſwer the extent of our limited faculties. Thoſe who adopt this ſingular rule muſt, at the ſame time, grant that the number of religions muſt be nearly equal to that of individuals. For as there is a great variety in the talents and capacities of different perſons, ſo what will appear difficult and abſtruſe to one, will ſeem evident and clear to another; and thus the more diſcerning and penetrating will adopt as divine truth, what the ſlow and ſuperficial will look upon as unintelligible jargon. This conſequence does not at all alarm the Socinians, who ſuffer their members to explain, in very different ways, many doctrines of the higheſt importance, and permit every one to follow his particular fancy in compoſing his theological ſyſtem, provided they acknowledge, in general, the truth and authenticity of the hiſtory of CHRIST, and adhere to the precepts the Goſpel lays down for the regulation of our lives and actions.

The ſum and ſubſtance of Socinianiſm.

XVII. In conſequence of this leading maxim, the Socinians either reject without exception, or change and accommodate to their limited capacities, all thoſe doctrines relating to the nature of

God and of JESUS CHRIST, the plan of redemption, and the eternal rewards and puniſhments unfolded in the Goſpel, which they either cannot comprehend, or conſider as attended with conſiderable difficulties. The ſum of their theology is as follows: "God, who is infinitely more "perfect than man, though of a ſimilar na- "ture in ſome reſpects, exerted an act of that "power by which he governs all things; in con- "ſequence of which an extraordinary perſon was "born of the Virgin MARY. That perſon was "JESUS CHRIST, whom God firſt tranſlated to "heaven by that portion of his divine power, "which is called the *Holy Ghoſt*; and having in- "ſtructed him fully there in the knowledge of his "will, counſels, and deſigns, ſent him again into "this ſublunary world, to promulgate to man- "kind a new rule of life, more excellent than that "under which they had formerly lived, to propa- "gate divine truth by his miniſtry, and to con- "firm it by his death.

"Thoſe who obey the voice of this Divine "Teacher (and this obedience is in the power "of every one whoſe will and inclination leads "that way), ſhall one day be clothed with new "bodies, and inhabit eternally thoſe bleſſed re- "gions, where God himſelf immediately reſides. "Such, on the contrary, as are diſobedient and "rebellious, ſhall undergo moſt terrible and ex- "quiſite torments, which ſhall be ſucceeded by "annihilation, or the total extinction of their "being."

The whole ſyſtem of Socinianiſm, when ſtripped of the embelliſhments and commentaries with which it has been loaded and diſguiſed by its doctors, is really reducible to the few propoſitions now mentioned.

The moral doctrine of the Socinians.

XVIII. The nature and genius of the Socinian theology has an immediate influence upon the

moral

moral ſyſtem of that ſect, and naturally leads its doctors to confine their rules of morality and virtue to the *external* actions and duties of life. On the one hand, they deny the influence of a divine ſpirit and power upon the minds of men; and, on the other, they acknowledge, that no mortal has ſuch an empire over himſelf as to be able to ſuppreſs or extinguiſh his ſinful propenſities and corrupt deſires. Hence they have no concluſion left, but one, and that is, to declare all ſuch true and worthy Chriſtians, whoſe *words* and external *actions* are conformable to the precepts of the Divine law. It is, at the ſame time, remarkable, that another branch of their doctrine leads directly to the utmoſt ſeverity in what relates to life and manners, ſince they maintain, that the great end of CHRIST's miſſion upon earth was to exhibit to mortals a new law, diſtinguiſhed from all others by its unblemiſhed ſanctity and perfection. Hence it is, that a great number of the Socinians have fallen into the fanatical rigour of the ancient Anabaptiſts, and judged it abſolutely unlawful to repel injuries, to take oaths, to inflict capital puniſhments on malefactors, to oppoſe the deſpotic proceedings of tyrannical magiſtrates, to acquire wealth by honeſt induſtry, and other things of that nature. But, in this, there is ſomething extremely ſingular, and they are here, indeed, inconſiſtent with themſelves. For while, in matters of doctrine, they take the greateſt liberty with the expreſſions of Scripture, and pervert them in a violent manner, to the defence of their peculiar tenets, they proceed quite otherwiſe, when they come to preſcribe rules of conduct from the precepts of the Goſpel; for then they underſtand theſe precepts literally, and apply them without the leaſt diſtinction of times, perſons, and circumſtances.

The Catechiſm of *Racow*.

XIX. It muſt carefully be obſerved, that the *Catechiſm of Racow*, which moſt people look upon as the great ſtandard of Socinianiſm, and as an accurate ſummary of the doctrine of that ſect, is, in reality, no more than a collection of the popular tenets of the Socinians, and by no means a juſt repreſentation of the ſecret opinions and ſentiments of their doctors [*q*]. The writings, therefore, of theſe learned men muſt be peruſed with attention, in order to our knowing the hidden reaſons and true principles from whence the doctrines of the Catechiſm are derived. It is obſervable, beſides, that, in this Catechiſm, many Socinian tenets and inſtitutions, which might have contributed to render the ſect ſtill more odious, and to expoſe its internal conſtitution too much to public view, are entirely omitted; ſo that it ſeems to have been leſs compoſed for the uſe of the Socinians themſelves, than to impoſe upon ſtrangers, and to mitigate the indignation which the tenets of this community had excited in the minds of many [*r*]. Hence it never obtained, among the Socinians, the authority of a public confeſſion or rule of faith; and hence the doctors of that ſect were authoriſed to correct and contradict it, or to ſubſtitute another form of doctrine in its place. It is alſo obſervable, that the moſt eminent writers and patrons of the Socinians, give no clear or conſiſtent account of the ſentiments of that ſect in relation to eccleſiaſtical diſcipline and government, and the form of public worſhip. All that we know is, that they follow in theſe matters, generally ſpeaking, the cuſtoms received in the proteſtant churches [*s*].

[*q*] We have an account of the authors of this famous *Catechiſm*, and of the various ſucceſs it met with, in the *Commentatio de Catecheſi Racovienſi*, publiſhed by JO. AND. SCHMIDIUS, in the year 1707. See alſo KOECHIERI *Biblioth. Theolog. Symbolicæ*.—A new edition of the *Catechiſm* itſelf, with a ſolid refutation of the doctrine it contains, was publiſhed in 8vo at *Francfort* and *Leipſick*, in the year 1739, by the learned GEORGE LEWIS OEDER.

[*r*] This appears evident enough from their preſenting a Latin tranſlation of this Catechiſm to JAMES I., king of *Great Britain*, and a German one to the academy of *Wittemberg*.

The ſtate of learning among the Socinians.

XX. The firſt founders and patrons of this ſect were eminently diſtinguiſhed by their learning and genius. Their ſucceſſors, however, did not follow their ſteps, in this reſpect, nor keep up the reputation they had univerſally obtained. The *Unitarians* in *Poland* ſeem to have had little ambition of ſcience. They gave no encouragement to learning or talents; and appeared little ſolicitous of having in their community ſubtile doctors and learned diſputants. But, when they perceived, on the one hand, that the ſucceſs of their community required as able defenders, as they had learned and ingenious adverſaries; and were ſo lucky, on the other, as to obtain the privilege of erecting ſeminaries of learning at *Racow* and *Lublin*, they then changed their ſentiments with reſpect to this matter, and became ſenſible of the neceſſity under which they lay, to encourage in their community a zeal for the ſciences. This zeal increaſed greatly from the time that FAUSTUS SOCINUS undertook the reſtoration of their declining credit, and put himſelf at the head of their tottering ſect. At that time many perſons, diſtinguiſhed by their birth, education, and talents, embraced its doctrine, and contributed to promote the love of ſcience among its members. Then the youth were taught the rules of eloquence and rhetoric, and inſtructed in the important branches of Oriental, Greek, and Latin literature. Nay, even the ſecret paths of philoſophy were opened, though their treaſures were diſcloſed only to a few, who were ſelected, for that purpoſe, from the multitude. The Racovian doctors, in compliance with the ſpirit and taſte of the age, choſe ARISTOTLE as their guide in philoſophy, as appears evidently from the *Ethics* of CRELLIUS, and other literary records of theſe times.

[*s*] This is manifeſt from a work compoſed by PETER MORSCOVIUS, or MORSCOWSKY, under the following title: *Politia Eccleſiaſtica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, ſive forma Regiminis exterioris Eccleſiarum Chriſtianarum in Poloniâ, quæ unum Deum Patrem, per filium ejus Unigenitum in Spiritu Sancto, confitentur.* This work, which is divided into three books, was compoſed in the year 1642, and publiſhed in 4to at *Nuremberg*, but a few years ago, by the learned GEORGE LEWIS OEDER. It is mentioned by SANDIUS, in his *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 142. who ſays that it was drawn up *for the uſe of the Belgic churches*,

Their method of proceeding in theology.

XXI. Notwithſtanding this progreſs of philoſophy among the Socinians, their doctors ſeemed to reject its ſuccours in theology with obſtinacy and diſdain. They declare, in numberleſs places of their writings, that both in the interpretation of ſcripture, and in explaining and demonſtrating the truths of religion in general, clearneſs and ſimplicity are alone to be conſulted, and no regard paid to the ſubtilties of philoſophy and logic. And, indeed, had their doctors and interpreters followed in practice, this rule that they have laid down with ſo much oſtentation in theory, they would have ſaved their adverſaries, and perhaps themſelves, much trouble. But this is by no means the caſe. For, in the greateſt part of their theological productions, their pretended ſimplicity is frequently accompanied with much ſubtility, and with the moſt refined intricacies of ſcientific art. And, what is ſtill more inexcuſable, they reaſon with the greateſt dexterity and acuteneſs concerning thoſe ſubjects, which (as they ſurpaſs the reach of the human underſtanding) are generally received, among other Chriſtians, as *facts* confirmed by the moſt reſpectable *teſtimony*, and conſequently as matters of pure *faith*, while they diſcover little ſagacity, or ſtrength of judgment,

ment, in thoſe diſcuſſions which are within the ſphere of reaſon, and are properly amenable to its tribunal. They are acute where they ought to be ſilent, and they reaſon awkwardly where ſagacity and argument are required. Theſe are certainly great inconſiſtencies; yet they proceed from one and the ſame principle, even the maxim univerſally received in this community, that all things *that ſurpaſs the limits of human comprehenſion are to be entirely baniſhed from the Chriſtian religion.*

The diviſions of the Socinians, and their inteſtine controverſies.

XXII. It has been already obſerved, that the *Unitarians* had no ſooner ſeparated themſelves from the Reformed churches in *Poland*, than they became a prey to inteſtine diviſions, and were ſplit into ſeveral factions. The points of doctrine that gave riſe to theſe diviſions, related to the dignity of CHRIST's *nature* and *character*, the unlawfulneſs of *Infant-Baptiſm*, the *perſonality* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to which were added ſeveral alterations, concerning the duties of life, and the rules of conduct that were obligatory on Chriſtians. The ſects, produced by theſe diviſions, were not all equally obſtinate. Some of them entertained pacific diſpoſitions, and ſeemed inclined towards a reconciliation. But two, particularly, maintained tenaciouſly their ſentiments, and perſiſted in their ſeparation; theſe were the *Budnæans* and the *Farnovians*. The former were ſo called from their leader SIMON BUDNÆUS, a man of conſiderable acuteneſs and ſagacity, who, more dexterous than the reſt of his brethren in deducing conſequences from their principles, and perceiving plainly the concluſions to which the peculiar principles of LÆLIUS SOCINUS naturally led, denied flatly all kinds of religious worſhip to JESUS CHRIST. Nor did BUDNÆUS ſtop here; in order to give a more ſpecious colour to this capital error, and to maintain it upon conſiſtent grounds, he aſſerted that CHRIST was not begotten by an

Budnæans.

extraordinary act of Divine power, but that he was born like other men, in a natural way. This hypotheſis, however conformable to the fundamental principles of Socinianiſm, appeared intolerable and impious to the greateſt part of that community. Hence BUDNÆUS, who had gained over to his doctrine a great number of proſelytes in *Lithuania* and *Ruſſian Poland*, was depoſed from his miniſterial functions, in the year 1584, and publicly excommunicated with all his diſciples. It is ſaid, however, that he afterwards abandoned his peculiar and offenſive ſentiments, and was again re-admitted to the communion of that ſect [*t*].

The ſentiments of Budnæus embraced by Davides and Franckens.

XXIII. This heretical doctrine, which had created ſo much trouble to BUDNÆUS, was ſoon after adopted by FRANCIS DAVIDES, a Hungarian, who was the ſuperintendant of the Socinian churches in *Tranſylvania*, and who oppoſed, with the greateſt ardour and obſtinacy, the cuſtom of offering up prayers and divine worſhip to JESUS CHRIST. Several methods were uſed to reclaim him from this offenſive error. BLANDRATA employed all the power of his eloquence for this purpoſe, and, to render his remonſtrances ſtill more effectual, ſent for FAUSTUS SOCINUS, who went accordingly into *Tranſylvania*, in the year 1573, and ſeconded his arguments and exhortations with the utmoſt zeal and perſeverance. But DAVIDES remained unmoved, and was, in conſequence of this obſtinate adherence to his error, thrown into priſon by CHRISTOPHER BATHORY, prince of *Tranſylvania*; where he died, in the year 1579, in an advanced age [*u*]. This his unhappy fate did not, however, extinguiſh the controverſy to which his doctrine had given riſe. For he left behind him diſciples and friends, who ſtrenuouſly maintained his ſentiments, ſtood firm againſt the oppoſition that was made to them, and created much uneaſineſs to SOCINUS and his followers in *Lithuania* and *Poland*. The moſt eminent of theſe were JACOB PALÆOLOGUS, of the iſle of *Chio*, who was burnt at *Rome*, in the year 1585; CHRISTIAN FRANCKEN, who had diſputed in perſon with SOCINUS; and JOHN SUMMER [*w*], who was maſter of the academy of *Clauſenburg* [*x*]. This little ſect is branded by the Socinian writers, with the ignominious appellation of *Semi-Judaizers* [*y*].

[*t*] See SANDII *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 54, 55.—*Epiſtola de Vita Wiſſowatii*, p. 226.—RINGELTAUBE's German *Diſſertation on the Poliſh Bibles*, p. 144. 152.—SAMUEL CRELLIUS, the moſt learned Socinian of our times, looks upon ADAM NEUSER *, who was baniſhed on account of his erroneous ſentiments, to have been the author of this doctrine, which is ſo derogatory from the dignity of JESUS CHRIST. See CRELLII *Theſaur. Epiſtol. Crozian.* tom. i. p. 111.

* See § xiv. of this chapter.

XXIV. The

[*u*] SANDIUS, *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 55, 56.—FAUST. SOCIN. *Oper.* tom. i. p. 353. 395. tom. ii. p. 713. 771. where there is an account of his conference and diſpute with FRANCIS DAVIDES.—STAN. LUBIENIECII *Hiſtor. Reform. Polonicæ*, lib. iii. c. xi. p. 228.

[*w*] See SANDIUS, *loc. cit.* p. 57, 58. The diſpute between SOCINUS and FRANCKEN is related at large in the *Works* of the former, tom. ii. p. 767.

☞ [*x*] *Clauſenburg*, otherwiſe *Coloſwar*, is a town in *Tranſylvania*, extremely populous and well fortified. The Socinians have here a public ſchool and a printing-houſe; and their community in this place is very numerous. Till the year 1603, they were in poſſeſſion of the cathedral, which was then taken from them and given to the Jeſuits, whoſe college and church they had pulled down.

[*y*] FAUSTUS SOCINUS wrote a particular Treatiſe againſt the *Semi-Judaizers*, which is publiſhed in the ſecond volume of his Works, p. 804. It is, however, worthy of obſervation, that the motive which engaged SOCINUS and his friends to employ ſo much pains and labour in the ſuppreſſion of this faction, was not a perſuaſion of the pernicious tendency of its doctrines or peculiar notions. On the contrary, SOCINUS himſelf expreſsly acknowledges, that this controverſy turns upon matters of very little importance, by declaring it, as his opinion, that praying or offering up divine worſhip to CHRIST, is

CENT. XVI. SECT. III. PART II.

The Farnovian ſect.

XXIV. The *Farnovians* were treated by the Socinians with much more indulgence. They were neither excluded from the communion of the ſect, nor obliged to renounce their peculiar tenets; they were only exhorted to conceal them prudently, and not to publiſh or propagate them in their diſcourſes from the pulpit [z]. This particular branch of the Socinian community was ſo called

---

is not neceſſary to ſalvation. Thus, in his anſwer to *Wujeck*, (*Opp.* tom. ii. p. 538.) he expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: *The Chriſtian, whoſe faith is ſo great, as to encourage him to make his addreſſes habitually and directly to the Supreme Being, and who ſtandeth not in need of the comfort that flows from the invocation of* CHRIST, his brother, *who* was tempted in all things like as he is, *that a Chriſtian is not obliged to call upon the name of Jeſus, by prayer or ſupplication* *. According therefore to the opinion of Socinus, thoſe who lay aſide all regard to CHRIST as an Interceſſor, and addreſs themſelves *directly* to God *alone*, have a greater meaſure of faith than others. But, if this be ſo, why did he oppoſe with ſuch vehemence and animoſity the ſentiment of DAVIDES, who, in effect, did no more than exhort all Chriſtians to addreſs themſelves *directly* and immediately to the Father? Here there appears to be a ſtriking inconſiſtency. We find alſo LUBIENIECIUS, in his *Hiſtor. Reformat. Polonicæ*, lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 228. ſpeaking lightly enough of this controverſy, and repreſenting it as a matter of very little moment; whence he ſays, that in *Tranſylvania* there was *much ado about nothing* †. From all this, then, it appears manifeſt, that SOCINUS and his followers were more artful than ingenuous in their proceedings with reſpect to DAVIDES. They perſecuted him and his followers, leſt by tolerating his doctrine, they ſhould increaſe the *odium* under which they already lay, and draw upon themſelves anew, the reſentment of other Chriſtian churches, while, in their private judgment, they looked upon this very doctrine, and its profeſſors, as worthy of toleration and indulgence.

[z] *Epiſtola de Vita Wiſſowatii*, p. 226.—ERASMUS JOHANNIS (as we are informed by SANDIUS, *Biblioth. Anti-Trinit.* p. 87.) was admitted Profeſſor of Divinity in the Socinian academy at *Clauſenburg*, on condition, that in his public diſcourſes he ſhould never ſay any thing of CHRIST's having exiſted before the Virgin MARY.

* *Quod ſi quis tanta eſt fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipſum perpetuo recta accedere audeat, nec conſolatione, quæ ex Chriſti Fratris ſui per omnia tentati invocatione proficiſcitur, indigeat, hic non opus habet, ut Chriſtum invocet.*

† *Fluctus in ſimpulo excitatos eſſe.*

from STANISLAUS FARNOVIUS, or FARNESIUS, who was engaged by GONESIUS to prefer the Arian ſyſtem to that of the Socinians, and conſequently aſſerted, that CHRIST had been engendered, or produced, out of nothing, by the Supreme Being, before the creation of this terreſtrial globe. It is not ſo eaſy to ſay, what his ſentiments were concerning the *Holy Ghoſt*; all we know of that matter is, that he warned his diſciples againſt paying the tribute of religious worſhip to that divine Spirit [a]. FARNOVIUS ſeparated from the other *Unitarians*, in the year 1568, and was followed, in this ſchiſm, by ſeveral perſons eminent on account of the extent of their learning, and the influence of their rank, ſuch as MARTIN CZECHOVICIUS, NEIMOIOVIUS, STANISLAUS WISNOWIUS, JOHN FALCON, GEORGE SCHOMAN, and others. They did not, however, form themſelves into a ſtable or permanent ſect. The lenity and indulgence of the Socinians, together with the dexterity of their diſputants, brought many of them back into the boſom of the community they had deſerted, and conſiderable numbers were diſperſed or regained by the prudence and addreſs of FAUSTUS SOCINUS. So that, at length, the whole faction, being deprived of its chief, who died in the year 1615, was ſcattered abroad, and reduced to nothing [b].

---

[a] SANDIUS, *Biblioth.* p. 52. & paſſim.

[b] We omit here an enumeration of the more famous Socinian writers who flouriſhed in this century, becauſe the greateſt part of them have already been mentioned in the courſe of this Hiſtory. The reſt may be eaſily collected from SANDIUS.

END OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

00110768

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 25 June, 2016